Ontario Council on University Affairs

Thirteenth Annual Report

March 1, 1986 to February 28, 1987

700 Bay Street
Seventh Floor,
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1Z6

Telephone: (416) 965-5233

March, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal 7

Members and Officers of the Ontario Council on University Affairs 1986-87 8

Introduction 9

Council's Advisory Memoranda 13

86-I Ministerial Consents Pursuant to the Degree Granting Act 15
- Introduction 15
- The Criteria To Be Applied 15
- Process for Reviewing Applications for Consents 17
- Renewals of Existing Consents 18
- GMI Engineering and Management Institute 18
- St. Stephen's College 23
- Niagara University 28
- Clarification Statement 34
- Appendix 36

86-II Government Support of the University System in 1987-88 and 1988-89 41
- New Initiatives by Government 41
- Government Support in Perspective 43
- Calculation of Funding Requirements for 1987-88 45
- Calculation of Funding Requirements for 1988-89 62

Estimated Government Grants Required to Meet the Basic Funding Objectives 67

Conclusion 68

Appendices 71

86-III An Assessment of the Council of Ontario Universities' Program Quality Appraisals Process 81

Appendix 82

86-IV Ministerial Consents Pursuant to the Degree Granting Act, 1983 111

Introduction 111

Renewals of Existing Consents 111

The Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago 111

Central Michigan University 116

Northern Illinois University 121

University of Bridgeport 126

Free University of Amsterdam 131

Conclusion 137

86-V Funding Arrangements for Programs at Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and Nipissing College 139

Existing Funding Arrangements 139

Current Problems 140

Modifications to the Current Funding Arrangements 142

86-VI The Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program 1987-88 145

Introduction 145

Scholarship Stipend Value 145

Number of Awards 147

Institutional Awards 148

Visa Student Awards 149

Conclusion 150

86-VII Modification of the Operating Grants Formula 151

Evolution of the Operating Grants Formula 151

Proposed Modifications to the Operating Grants Allocation Formula 156

Overview of the Proposed Mechanism 160

Detailed Description of the Proposed Mechanism 161

Summary 187

Accountability 188

Conclusion 188

86-VIII Graduate Program Funding 191

Introduction 191

I. New Graduate Programs 191

Accounting (MAcc), University of Waterloo 191

Canadian Heritage and Development Studies (MA), Trent University 192

Computer Science (PhD), University of Western Ontario 193

Legal Translation (Graduate Diploma), University of Ottawa 194

II. Existing Graduate Programs 196

Appendices 197

86-IX Undergraduate Quasi-Professional and Professional Program Funding 223

I. Undergraduate Quasi-Professional Programs 223

Administrative and Information Studies Stream, Administrative and Commercial Studies Program (BA), University of Western Ontario 223

Gerontology and Another Subject (BA and Honours BA), McMaster University 227

Hispanic Studies (Combined Honours BA [Major and Minor] and General Honours BA [Major]), York University (Glendon College) 231

Labour Studies (Honours BA), McMaster University 236

Music Performance (Honours BMus), McMaster University 237

Portuguese Studies (BA Minor), York University (Glendon College) 239

II. Professional Programs 244

Civil Engineering and Computer Systems (BEng), McMaster University 244

Materials Engineering (BEng), McMaster University 245

Appendices 247

OCUA Public Hearings 1986-87 **257**

OCUA Recommendations and Government Responses 1986-87 **259**

Response to Advisory Memorandum 86-VI **263**

Update to Program Approvals Procedure **265**

Ontario

Ontario
Council on
University
Affairs

416/965-5233

7th Floor
700 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1Z8

February 28, 1987

The Honorable Gregory Sorbara
Minister of Colleges and Universities
101 Bloor Street West
13th floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1P7

Dear Minister:

I respectfully submit herewith the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Ontario Council on University Affairs, which covers the period from March 1st, 1986 to February 28th, 1987.

Since my term will conclude shortly, I wish to express my thanks to you, your predecessors, and the officials of your Ministry for the courtesy and co-operation shown during my years as Chairman.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all in the university community who assisted by providing advice and assistance in response to many requests.

It has been a remarkable privilege to have served with the members and staff of Council. I will treasure their support, their commitment, and their loyalty.

Yours sincerely,

Marnie Paikin

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF THE ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS 1986-87

Mary Ascah (1988)
Huntsville

Suzanne Aziz (1987)
London

Liliane Beauchamp (1989)
Sudbury

Jean-Michel Beillard (1989)
Ottawa

William Broadhurst (1990)
Toronto

Charles Carmichael (1987)
London

Jack Cole (1988)*
Willowdale

Frank DeMarco (1987)
Windsor

Kelle Dunlop (1989)
Toronto

Harrry Eastman (1989)
Toronto

Carlton Gyles (1987)
Guelph

Dan LaCaprara (1988)
Etobicoke

Anne-Marie Lepine (1989)
Ottawa

Susan McCartney (1988)
Thunder Bay

Terrence Meagher (1987)*
Etobicoke

Henry Nelles (1989)
Toronto

Marnie Paikin, Chairman (1987)
Burlington

John Panabaker (1987)*
Kitchener

Carol Phillips (1990)
Toronto

Norman Sheffe (1989)
St. Catharines

Alanna Snell (1987)
Toronto

William Townshend (1987)
Waterloo

Joel Abelson (to October 1986)
Research Officer

Diane Davey
Administrative Assistant

Susan Pape (to April 1986)
Administrative Assistant

Diana Royce
Research Officer

Paul Senton
Senior Research Officer

Member's terms expire on February 28th of the year indicated in parenthesis.

* resigned before term completed

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The Thirteenth Annual Report of the Ontario Council on University Affairs covers the period March 1, 1986 to February 28, 1987 and contains the full text of all Advisory Memoranda issued during the year. The report also contains a list of Council's public meetings for the year and the response of the Government to the recommendations made by Council.

COUNCIL'S ADVISORY MEMORANDA

86-I MINISTERIAL CONSENTS PURSUANT TO THE DEGREE GRANTING ACT

Introduction

The Degree Granting Act, Chapter 36, Statutes of Ontario, 1983, which came into force on June 30, 1984, restricts the granting of degrees, the offering of degree programs and the use of the word "university" to institutions authorized to do so by the Legislature or, in the case of institutions established outside Ontario, to those granted a consent to do so by the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

In Advisory Memorandum 85-III, in response to a request from the Minister, Council provided advice with respect to the criteria used in reviewing requests for Ministerial consents pursuant to the Degree Granting Act. By letter of November 20, 1985, the Minister responded to Council's advice and requested that Council assess all applications from out-of-province institutions against new criteria outlined in the revised Ministry policy statement (Appendix A), and advise on whether Ministerial consents should be granted to out-of-province institutions.

Nine Ministerial consents have been granted of which four expire on June 30, 1986 and five on August 31, 1986. All of these consents were granted on the basis of criteria which were in place prior to the Ministry's policy review. The renewal of these consents and any new applications from out-of-province institutions wishing to offer degree programs in Ontario will be subject to the new criteria contained in the Ministry's revised policy statement. In this memorandum, Council offers advice with respect to three institutions whose consents expire on June 30, 1986, and whose applications for renewal have been submitted.

The Criteria To Be Applied

According to the Ministry's revised policy statement governing the issuing of Ministerial consents and the specific criteria contained therein, Council's assessment of each institution's application will focus on three areas.

1. The institution's status in its home jurisdiction and certain accreditation documentation if applicable.

The Ministry's policy indicates that Canadian out-of-province institutions wishing to operate in Ontario will be granted a consent only if the institution is a corporation and is a university or degree-granting institution established in Canada by either an Act of the Parliament of Canada or an Act of a legislature of a province other than Ontario. The institution must also be a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC).

The policy statement also specifies that institutions based in the United States which intend to offer degree programs in Ontario must be accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of Education of the United States of America. In addition, the individual degree program to be offered in Ontario by an institution based in the United States must be accredited by an accrediting agency designated by the Minister and recognized by the Secretary of Education of the United States. Such universities may also be required to file proof with the Minister that the accrediting agency has certified that the degree program being offered in Ontario meets the same standards as programs offered by the institution within its home state. In this connection, the accrediting agency is required to certify standards with respect to admission requirements, curricula, qualifications of faculty, hours of instruction, access to library and laboratory facilities and requirements for graduation. The university may also be requested to file proof that the accrediting agency has conducted a recent on-site inspection of the premises and training facilities in the location where the degree program is offered in Ontario.

The Ministry's policy statement distinguishes between institutions based outside Canada or the United States and institutions which are based in the United States. It specifies that institutions outside Canada or the United States which intend to offer degree programs in Ontario will be granted consent to do so only if the institution is a university or degree-granting institution established under the laws of its home jurisdiction. The institution must either be fully accredited by an accrediting agency or be fully authorized to grant degrees in its own jurisdiction. As well, the institution must be recognized by the Minister and meet other requirements as the Minister may prescribe.

2. The societal need and student demand for the proposed program.

Council will assess the potential benefit to Ontario residents of the proposed program by examining societal need and student demand. Council has developed considerable experience in providing judgement on the societal need and student demand for proposed programs as a result of its role in recommending to the Minister on the eligibility for public funding of both undergraduate and graduate programs at Ontario institutions.

3. The institution's Ontario on-site facility and library services.

Council will determine whether the institution's Ontario on-site facility and library services are adequate. Council's consideration of an institution's library service arrangements will be guided by specific criteria contained in the policy statement.

Council will assess all applications from out-of-province institutions against the criteria outlined above and then formulate its advice to the Minister on whether a consent should be granted. As indicated in the policy statement, Council will also recommend any special conditions that should pertain to the granting of such consents.

Process for Reviewing Applications for Consents

Council has developed the following process for reviewing applications for Ministerial consents.

All applications from out-of-province institutions along with appropriate supporting documentation will be submitted to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. The Ministry will ensure that documentation relating to the institution's status in its home jurisdiction is in order before forwarding the application to Council for examination. If an out-of province institution submits its application for a Ministerial consent to the Ministry by January 1 in any given year, Council will make every effort to forward a recommendation to the

Minister by June 1 of the same year. All consents will commence on July 1 and expire on June 30 in any given year. Institutions may wish to apply one year in advance to facilitate their long-term planning. This process pertains to all applications for Ministerial consents including those from new institutions as well as applications for the renewal of existing consents.

With respect to the duration of Ministerial consents, Council will recommend that a consent be granted for a period no longer than three years. The specific length of any consent will be based on Council's determination of what it deems to be appropriate. As the duration of consents will vary, students should be advised of the temporary nature and, in particular, the expiry date of an institution's Ministerial consent. Council will consider this matter more fully at the conclusion of this memorandum.

As noted, nine Ministerial consents have been granted to date, all of which expire in 1986. Council plans to deal with the renewal of these consents in two stages. This memorandum deals with applications by out-of-province institutions whose consents expire on June 30, 1986. Council's advice with respect to those institutions applying for a renewal of consent which expires on August 31, 1986 will be contained in a separate advisory memorandum to be forwarded to the Minister by August 1, 1986. It should be noted that, in the future, Council will submit its advice on Ministerial consents only once each year -- on or before June 1.

Renewals of Existing Consents

GMI Engineering and Management Institute

GMI Engineering and Management Institute was granted a Ministerial consent in July 1984 to offer its Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program in Oshawa and London for a period of two years. Enrolment in the program is restricted to General Motors employees and the consent enabled GMI to offer its program to employees at both the Oshawa and London General Motors plants. However, due to an insufficient number of applications from employees at the London plant, the program has been offered solely at the Oshawa location. In submitting its application for renewal, GMI has indicated that it is requesting a consent to continue offering the Master of Science in Manufacturing

Management program at the Oshawa location only.

Council's assessment of GMI's application for the renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

GMI is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program is included in the accreditation which GMI has been granted. Council notes that GMI's accreditation status was granted following a comprehensive evaluation, conducted in 1981-82, and is valid for five years. GMI's next comprehensive evaluation is due to occur in 1986-87.

The Ministerial consent which was issued to GMI in July 1984 was granted on the condition that the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools certify, by July 1, 1985, on the basis of a site visit, that:

> the degree program offered in Ontario meets the same standards that apply to the program as offered in the United States with respect to admission requirements, curricula, qualifications of faculty, hours of instruction, access to library and laboratory facilities and requirements for graduation.[1]

A site visit and evaluation of GMI's learning centre in Oshawa was conducted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in December 1984 and a report was later submitted to the Ministry certifying that the Master of Science in Manufacturing Management degree program offered in Oshawa met the same standards applied to the program offered at GMI's home campus in Flint, Michigan.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements for institutions based in the United States have been met by GMI and the Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program.

---

[1] Letter from the Honourable B. Stephenson to Dr. C. David Wurt, July 3, 1984.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

GMI's program meets the needs of managers of manufacturing operations by combining management theory and practice with the technical and logistical aspects of the manufacturing industry. The program is designed to enable engineers and other qualified individuals (generally those possessing undergraduate training in business) to move into positions as manufacturing managers. In this regard, the program's focus is upon the continued development of individuals who have proven themselves on the job and wish to develop an expertise in manufacturing management. A review of the curriculum indicates a concentration on the functional areas essential to manufacturing organizations such as finance, materials management, human resources management, marketing and manufacturing services. Council notes that this program is unique among graduate management programs currently offered in Ontario.

The program is delivered to students at Oshawa via videotape presentations of classroom lectures given at GMI's Flint campus. Although students in Oshawa do not attend the lecture in person, they view videotapes of the actual lecture, observe the questions and answers of the students studying at GMI's home campus and use the same study materials. Students at the Oshawa centre have telephone access to their professors during scheduled office hours and a course coordinator is present to distribute materials, show the videotapes and collect homework assignments. All requirements for the program, including assignments and examinations, are graded by the course professors in Flint who use the same standard for Oshawa students that is applied to the work of GMI students at the home campus.

The program's delivery method is designed for and limited to experienced, high-potential employees in the manufacturing industry who, because of their irregular schedules, would otherwise have difficulty attending the classes necessary to obtain a graduate degree at an Ontario university. The videotape approach employed by GMI enables these individuals to have access to each of the lectures despite their schedule of work.

It is clear that the program's focus on manufacturing operations and its method of delivery are tailored to the particular needs of full-time employees in the manufacturing industry who wish to earn a graduate degree. Council notes that GMI's program meets a societal need not currently being met by an Ontario institution.

The demand for entry into the program, while strong at the outset, appears to have been met. The program was first offered to General Motors employees in Oshawa in September 1984, at which time 32 applications were received and 27 students were admitted. One year later in September 1985, only five new applications were received for admission to the program. Enrolment has remained steady during the first two years of the program's operation, at between 24 and 27 students.

According to GMI, the experience at the Oshawa location of an initially strong student demand for the program followed by a significant drop in interest is normal. Unless a large turnover in staff or major expansion occurs at the sponsoring organization during the period in which the program is offered, it is GMI's expectation that those qualified employees who are interested in the program will enrol within the first two years. In fact, once the approximately two dozen General Motors employees currently enrolled have completed the program GMI has indicated that it will, in all likelihood, cease operations at the Oshawa location.

In light of these circumstances, Council is satisfied that a demand for the program from those currently enrolled will exist for at least the next three years. In three years time the majority of students will have completed the requirements of their degree and the demand for the program should then be assessed once again.

Council is satisfied that both a societal need and student demand exist for this program.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

General Motors of Canada provides classroom facilities and videotape playback equipment in support of the Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program at its Education and Training Centre in Whitby. In addition, students have access to computer facilities at the Centre and are afforded full use of the Centre's software packages.

Although no library facility exists at the Oshawa site, GMI has chosen, instead, to supply all required materials directly to each student. The current practice is for GMI faculty to determine the necessary materials including books, journals, photocopies of articles and technical papers as dictated by the requirements of each course, and then arrange for the GMI (Flint) library to send the material to each student at the Oshawa location. Students at the Oshawa location are also guaranteed access to the GMI library in Flint for bibliographic assistance and the provision of additional material.

GMI's method of approach in these areas is consistent with accepted forms of distance education. While Council believes that the students at the Oshawa location would benefit from an on-site research facility, it notes that GMI's Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program is not a research-intensive graduate degree and that the library service arrangements provided appear to be adequate to support the program. In addition, it is Council's judgement that the facilities provided by General Motors at its Education and Training Centre are appropriate and reasonable considering the video-based educational approach employed by GMI at all of its off-campus locations.

Recommendation

Council has carefully reviewed GMI's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program in Oshawa and is satisfied that the relevant criteria have been met.

In light of the circumstances noted above with respect to the student demand for the program and the likelihood that those currently enrolled will complete their studies in three years, Council believes that the renewal of GMI's consent should cover a three year period. However, given that GMI's accreditation status is valid only through 1986-87 and a comprehensive evaluation is due to occur at that time, it is Council's view that the renewal of the consent must be conditional on GMI maintaining its accreditation status in the United States. Further, it should be the responsibility of the Ministry to ensure that this condition is met.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-1 **MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANUFACTURING MANAGEMENT AT GMI ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE**

THAT, GMI Engineering and Management Institute be granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Master of Science in Manufacturing Management program in Oshawa, Ontario for a period of three years from July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1989 on the condition that GMI maintains its accreditation status in the United States.

St. Stephen's College

St. Stephen's College of Edmonton, Alberta, was granted a Ministerial consent in July 1984 to offer its Doctor of Ministry (DMin) program for a period of two years. The initial consent was granted to St. Stephen's College to offer this program in Eastern Ontario in cooperation with Queen's Theological College and its Master of Theology program. The consent was granted on the basis of St. Stephen's legislative charter (Alberta), its affiliation with the University of Alberta (AUCC member), associate membership status in the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in the United States and Canada[2], and a positive recommendation from the Theological Co-ordinating Committee on Theological Education in Canada (now the Churches' Council on Theological Education in Canada).[3]

St. Stephen's original Ministerial consent was based on the assumption that responsibility for the program would be shared between themselves and the staff of Queen's Theological College. However, the significant contribution to the program envisioned for the Queen's staff never developed beyond a limited administrative role. In its application for a renewal of Ministerial consent, St. Stephen's College indicated that it had formally assumed primary responsibility for the Ontario-based Doctor of Ministry program. Future involvement by Queen's would be officially limited to student supervision and/or directed study by contract, and the admission of St. Stephen's students to regularly scheduled Queen's courses.

---

[2] St. Stephen's is an associate, rather than full member of ATS because it does not grant a first degree (Master of Divinity).

[3] Letter from Rodger L. Cummins, Director, University Relations Branch, to Dr. William J. Close, Academic Dean, St. Stephen's College, January 24, 1986.

It is on the basis of this new arrangement that Council has reviewed the application of St. Stephen's College for a renewal of its consent. Council's assessment of the application is as follows.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

On the basis of St. Stephen's College's incorporation and legislative charter in the Province of Alberta, and its affiliation with the University of Alberta, a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Council is satisfied that St. Stephen's College has met the home jurisdiction requirements for Canadian out-of-province institutions.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Doctor of Ministry program offered by St. Stephen's College is a professional degree program taken on a part-time basis by clergy who remain in-service while studying social or ecclesiastical issues relevant to their community. The program requires a Master of Divinity degree and at least three years of in-ministry service. Council notes that the DMin degree is not a degree that would meet the requirements of, nor lead to, a university teaching position:

> It should be understood that the D.Min. is a professional degree (like a lawyer's Doctor of Jurisprudence) in contrast to the academic degree. To teach in a college or a seminary, one should seek a Ph.d....[4]

---

[4] Galbreath, John. "Doctor of Ministry: New Dimension in Theological Education", November 23, 1981. Submission of the Churches' Council on Theological Education in Canada to the Ontario Council on University Affairs, April 3, 1986.

In general, the purpose of the DMin program is to upgrade the competence of the pastoral ministry and prepare clergy for their assumption of additional responsibilities as resource people, community leaders and continuing education instructors. However, program content is personally tailored to meet the specific needs of clergy expanding their ministry into specialized areas in which they currently possess limited competence.

This program is important to the professional development of clergy engaged in parish ministry, who require advanced training in counselling skills, community development and personal growth in order to respond effectively to the needs of their congregation. The DMin program also satisfies the needs of clergy seeking the specialized training necessary for a career in hospital or prison ministry.

Since the three-year Master of Divinity degree is not considered sufficient training to sustain a creative professional ministerial career over a lifetime, the Doctor of Ministry program has also become an important part of a long-term strategy of professional development encouraged by individual churches and ecumenical church associations.

Prior to the offering of the St. Stephen's program in the Kingston area, there was only one other Doctor of Ministry program available in the province for over six thousand ordained Ontario-based clergy. Consequently, a number of DMin candidates travelled abroad for their education, while American-based DMin programs, viewed as being of inferior quality, were being offered in Ontario.[5]

The Ontario-based program offered by the Toronto School of Theology (TST), an affiliate of the University of Toronto, is unable to accommodate students outside the Toronto area because its enrolment is restricted to ten new students per year, who must live within commuting distance of the Toronto campus. By making a Canadian DMin program available in eastern Ontario, St. Stephen's has enhanced the educational opportunities for

---

5. Telephone interview, Dr. Lloyd Gesner, Executive Director, The Churches' Council on Theological Education in Canada, April 2, 1986.

clergy engaged in full-time ministry and American institutions have ceased their operations in the province.

St. Stephen's is no longer offering the DMin program in cooperation with Queen's Theological College. While Queen's is not planning a program of its own, Queen's administrators are exploring the possibility of an association with the Toronto School of Theology, where some TST courses would be offered in Kingston. Council notes that this arrangement, if implemented, would not come into effect earlier than 1987.

Further, the Churches' Council on Theological Education in Canada has indicated that there remains an unmet need in northern and western Ontario for this program and that they "would urge St. Stephen's to continue to service clergy living in other parts of Ontario who do not have easy access to either Queen's or TST"[6] if Queen's did eventually offer a program in the eastern Ontario region.

During the initial consent period, 1983-84, there were five Ontario students enrolled in the St. Stephen's DMin program. One additional student enrolled in the program in 1985-86 for a total current enrolment of six Ontario-based DMin students. Council notes that St. Stephen's offers one of two DMin programs available in Canada, and is the only institution providing this program in Ontario outside the Toronto area.

Council is satisfied that a demand for the program from those currently enrolled will exist for at least the next two years. In two years the majority of students will have completed the requirements for their degrees and the demand for the program should then be reassessed.

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

---

[6] Letter from Dr. Lloyd Gesner, Executive Director, The Churches' Council on Theological Education in Canada, to the Ontario Council on University Affairs, April 3, 1986.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

St. Stephen's College has no need of physical facilities in Ontario at this time for its students to complete the four electives, Collegium and Practicum components of the Ontario-based DMin program.

Electives are taken at local universities, permitting students full use of the campus library during the time they are involved in course work.

The Practicum and Collegium components occur in or near the student's community and are supervised by individuals recruited and contracted by St. Stephen's. During the Collegium and Practicum phase, all St. Stephen's DMin students are permitted use of the St. Paul University (Ottawa) library and may purchase a Queen's University library card.

If necessary, St. Stephen's also will mail materials and resources to Ontario students during this period. Council notes that neither St. Stephen's nor Queen's Theological College staff are aware that St. Stephen's College students have ever encountered problems with respect to access to library resources.

Council considers these library arrangements to be adequate for the Collegium and Practicum phase, in light of the small number of students involved. However, if the number of students were to increase significantly, Council believes it would be necessary to re-evaluate the adequacy of this arrangement.

It is Council's judgement that St. Stephen's arrangements satisfy the criteria for on-site facility and library services.

Recommendation

Council has carefully reviewed St. Stephen's College's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Doctor of Ministry program in eastern Ontario.

Since Council believes it necessary to reassess student demand for the program in 1988, and since the presence of St. Stephen's College in eastern Ontario may be made redundant if a joint program were to be offered by Queen's Theological College and the Toronto School of Theology, the renewal of St. Stephen's College's consent should cover a two-year period.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-2	**DOCTOR OF MINISTRY AT ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE** **THAT, St. Stephen's College be granted consent to offer its Doctor of Ministry program in eastern Ontario for a period of two years, from July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1988.**

Niagara University

Niagara University was granted a Ministerial consent in July 1984 to offer its Master of Arts in Education and Master of Science in Education degree programs in Burlington, Hamilton, Kitchener, Mississauga, Oakville, Scarborough and Toronto for a period of two years. The original consent expires on June 30, 1986 and Niagara University has applied for a Ministerial consent to offer the programs at its extension sites in Ontario beyond that date. In submitting its application for renewal, Niagara has indicated that, in addition to the seven locations which were approved in the original consent, two extension sites at Oshawa and Brampton have since been established. Council notes that these two locations were added without approval from the Ministry.

Council's assessment of Niagara's application for the renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

Niagara University is accredited by the Commission of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. The accreditation includes off-campus sites in Ontario. The Ministerial consent which was issued to Niagara in July 1984 was granted on the condition that the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) certify by July 1, 1985:

- that it has accredited Niagara University's teacher education program;
- that it has visited at least two sites where the

program is being offered in Ontario; and

- that Niagara's degree program offered in Ontario meets the same standards that apply to the program as it is offered in the United States with respect to admission requirements, curricula, qualifications of faculty, hours of instruction, access to library and laboratory facilities and requirements for graduation.[7]

By letter of April 3, 1985, NCATE informed the Minister of its decision to grant accreditation to Niagara University's education programs. The letter also indicated that NCATE had found that Niagara's degree programs offered in Ontario met the same standards of quality as those programs offered at Niagara's home campus. This evaluation was made following site visits at two Ontario locations where Niagara's programs were offered.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements for institutions based in the United States have been met by Niagara University and the education programs it offers in Ontario.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

Niagara University offers courses leading to Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees in Education at its extension sites in Ontario. The area of concentration of the Master of Arts degree is Foundations and Teaching while the Master of Science degree program includes three areas of concentration: Administration and Supervision; Foundations and Teaching; and School Counseling. Ontario students enrolled in the Niagara programs are permitted to complete approximately one-half their course requirements through extension courses at the off-campus sites. Of the 33 credit hours required for the Master of Arts degree, 18 credit hours must be completed at Niagara University's home campus in Niagara Falls, New York. Similarly, of the 36 credit hours required for the Master of Science degree, 18 credit hours must be completed at the home campus.

Virtually all Ontario residents enrolled in the programs are practising teachers and are admitted on a part-time basis. Niagara University's graduate education courses provide an opportunity for Ontario teachers to prepare themselves for career advancement in Ontario schools. The Qualifications Evaluation Council of Ontario (QECO), on the basis of Niagara's accreditation status in the United States, recognizes credits earned by those who have completed Niagara courses both on campus and at Ontario extension sites. While QECO's responsibility is to evaluate and classify teacher qualifications, the extent to which QECO categories are related to salary scales is a matter for negotiation at the local level. Council understands that Niagara University credits are recognized by the majority of Ontario school boards for the appointment and promotion of teachers, counsellors, and administrators and for increases in the levels of remuneration for these groups.

---

[7] Letter from the Honourable B. Stephenson to Dr. John B. Stranges, July 3, 1984.

Ontario student enrolment constitutes a significant proportion of Niagara total enrolment in graduate education programs. Enrolment at Ontario extension sites during the Fall Term 1984, comprised approximately 62% (246 of 396 course registrations) of Niagara total graduate education enrolment. In the 1985 Fall Term some 58% (244 of 421 course registrations) of those enrolled in Niagara graduate education programs were from Ontario. According to statistics provided by Niagara, 78% and 79% of those graduating from the programs in 1984 and 1985 respectively, were from Ontario.

In light of the heavy concentration of Ontario residents enrolled in Niagara courses, Council surveyed Faculties of Education at several Ontario institutions to determine the capacity of their graduate programs and whether the demands of Ontario residents for graduate studies in education are being met. Given the geographic location of Niagara University and the location of its extension sites in Southern Ontario, Council requested additional information on program offerings at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and Brock University.

OISE offers MEd programs in nine specialized fields of study. With respect to the enrolment capacity of these programs, the extent to which OISE could accommodate additional enrolment at its main campus as well as the extension sites varies by specialization. According to OISE, it appears that capacity exists in six of the nine MEd programs offered:

For 1985/86 the Department of Educational Administration, Higher Education, History and Philosophy of Education, Measurement, Evaluation and Computer Applications (MECA), Sociology in Education, and Special Education, are not limiting enrolment and will continue to accept additional qualified applications. The Department of Curriculum will be accepting fewer students into its M.Ed. programs for 1986/87 due to constraints on departmental resources for the coming year arising from concern about staff/student ratios; it will likely return to its more usual rate of acceptance in the following year. The Department of Applied Psychology operates at full capacity and is not likely to extend its intake beyond its normal level. For 1986/87 the Department of Adult Education has filled its quota.[8]

OISE currently offers graduate courses at extension sites in several locations in Southern Ontario including Barrie, Hamilton, Humber College (Toronto), Kitchener and London. Departments participating in off-campus programs include Adult Education, Applied Psychology, Curriculum, Educational Administration, Higher Education, Sociology in Education and Special Education. OISE reports that all departments are committed to the provision of off-campus instruction and that, in most cases, enrolment could be expanded. Students studying off-campus are able to complete six of the eight required courses for the MEd at the extension site while the remaining two must be taken at OISE's main campus. In addition to the excess capacity which exists in the majority of OISE's MEd programs, Council notes that there is a significant overlap in the material covered by the offerings at OISE and Niagara University.

Brock University currently offers a Master of Education (MEd) program with three separate areas of concentration; Curriculum Studies; Foundations of Learning and Teaching Behaviour; and Educational Administration. In addition to the home campus, Brock's MEd is offered at off-campus sites at McMaster University and at the Oakville campus of Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology. Although the project or thesis requirement for the degree is offered only at

---

[8] Letter from Dr. M. Fullan, Assistant Director (Academic), Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, to Mrs. H. Paikin, April 24, 1986.

Brock University, all course requirements may be taken at the off-campus centres in Hamilton or Oakville. At present, approximately two-thirds of Brock's total enrolment is comprised of those studying at the off-campus centres.

According to Brock, their enrolment has remained strong over the years and the capacity of the MEd program is flexible:

> In fact there is an increase in admissions for the 1985-1986 period. In response to this, new faculty is being added this year. In other words, we are prepared to expand our mandate when we are called upon to do so.[9]

Admission to the Graduate Education programs at Niagara University requires a minimum undergraduate average of C+ during the last two years of undergraduate study. Entry to MEd programs at OISE requires an applicant to have completed an undergraduate degree equivalent to a University of Toronto bachelor's degree with mid-B standing. However, OISE indicates that exceptions can be made:

> Quite often we are able to make special cases to the School of Graduate Studies for some students who do not meet these minimum requirements but who have some particularly relevant professional experience or have demonstrated significant achievement which qualifies them for entry. However, the admission standards are high and this of course contributes to graduating quality students.[10]

Although Brock requires a mid-B average for admission to its MEd, the University has developed an upgrading program which will enable students to qualify for full admission to the Brock program. This policy of providing individual programs has resulted in a steady decline in rejection rates for program applicants.

---

[9] Letter from Dr. A.C. Bennett, Acting Dean, College of Education, Brock University, to Mrs. M. Paikin, April 17, 1986.

[10] Letter from Dr. M. Fullan to Mrs. M. Paikin, April 24, 1986.

In light of all the above, Council is satisfied that the current needs of Ontario residents for graduate education programs can be satisfactorily met by Ontario institutions. In particular, Council notes the flexibility of enrolment capacities at OISE and Brock and their willingness to take on additional enrolments. In addition, Council finds OISE's admission policies and Brock's efforts to provide upgrading opportunities for students seeking admission to the MEd a strong indication of their determination to be responsive to the needs of Ontario residents. The commitment of Brock and OISE to offering MEd programs at off-campus locations further demonstrates a willingness on the part of these institutions to meet societal needs.

Students enrolled in the MEd at Brock and OISE who attend classes at off-campus sites in Hamilton, Oakville, Toronto, Kitchener and Barrie enjoy greater convenience than their colleagues who are enrolled in the Niagara program given that the Niagara students are required to travel to the home campus to attend approximately one-half their courses. Brock students may complete all of their course work off-campus with the exception of the thesis/project component which requires attendance at Brock's home campus. Similarly, students at OISE studying off-campus are able to complete six of the eight required courses off-campus.

Council finds it reasonable to assume that Niagara students currently enrolled at extension sites in Brampton, Burlington, Hamilton, Kitchener, Mississauga, Oakville, Toronto, Scarborough and Oshawa, who already travel to Niagara Falls, New York to complete one-half the requirements for their degree, would find it no less convenient to study at Brock's off-campus locations in Hamilton and Oakville, at OISE's main campus or OISE's off-campus locations in Kitchener, Hamilton, or at Humber College in Toronto.

Ontario institutions are currently offering graduate education programs which cover substantially the same fields of study as the Niagara program and there is excess capacity at the Ontario institutions. In addition, the Ontario institutions have responded to the needs of Ontario residents by offering their programs at off-campus centres in many of the same locations as Niagara University.

Council is convinced that the Ontario universities have both the capacity and flexibility to meet the societal need for graduate education programs which has been identified by Niagara University.

Recommendation

It is Council's view that Niagara University's application does not meet all of the criteria and, therefore, its Ministerial consent should not be renewed. Although Niagara's original consent expires on June 30, 1986, Ontario residents may already be enrolled in Niagara courses offered at the extension sites during the summer months. Council believes that students enrolled in summer courses offered by Niagara should be permitted to complete those courses despite the expiration of Niagara's consent on June 30. However, Niagara University should not have Ministerial consent to enrol students in the Fall Term 1986 at Ontario extension sites.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-3

MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)
MASTER OF SCIENCE (EDUCATION)
AT NIAGARA UNIVERSITY

THAT, Niagara University's original consent be extended specifically to cover those students enrolled by June 30, 1986 for courses to be completed by September 1, 1986 and that a new consent not be granted.

Clarification Statement

As indicated in the Ministry's policy statement, all out-of-province institutions receiving a Ministerial consent will be required to include a "clarification statement" on all documents relating to the program offered in Ontario. The "clarification statement" is intended to encourage prospective registrants to verify for themselves whether the degree program offered would be recognized by potential employers and/or other post-secondary institutions. Council believes that, as part of this statement, all institutions should be required to indicate clearly the time period for which the consent has been granted and the expiry date of the consent. The inclusion of this additional information will serve as notification for those considering enrolling in degree programs offered by out-of-province institutions that, in fact, consent has been granted to operate in Ontario for a specific period of time.

M. Paikin
Chairman

May 23, 1986

APPENDIX A

Ministry of
Colleges and
Universities

Hon. Gregory Sorbara, Minister,
A. K. Adlington, Deputy Minister

Ministry of Colleges and Universities
Policy Statement
Re:

THE GRANTING OF MINISTERIAL CONSENTS

as authorized by the

DEGREE GRANTING ACT

(Chapter 36, Statutes of Ontario, 1983)

Ministry of Colleges and Universities
November 1985

POLICY STATEMENT

Section 4 of the Degree Granting Act, which came into force on June 30, 1984, allows the Minister of Colleges and Universities to give written consent to:

(a) a degree-granting institution established outside Ontario to enable it to do any one or more of the things mentioned in clauses 2 (a) to (d) of the Act; or

(b) a university established outside Ontario to enable it to do any one or more of the things mentioned in clauses 3 (a) to (d) of the Act.

The Minister will consider granting consents to universities and other degree-granting institutions based outside the province following a review of the institution's:

- status in its home jurisdiction and certain accreditation documentation if applicable;
- its proposed degree program and its potential benefit to Ontario residents; and
- its facility in Ontario and library service arrangements.

The following is intended to clarify the Ministry's policy with respect to the granting of these consents:

1. An institution will be considered for a consent only if it is a corporation and is:

   (a) a university or degree-granting institution established in Canada by

      (i) an act of the Parliament of Canada, or

      (ii) an act of a legislature of a province other than Ontario and is a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada;

   OR

   (b) a university or degree-granting institution established by or under the laws of one of the states of the United States of America, and which:

(i) is fully accredited by an accrediting agency or association recognized by the United States Secretary of Education, and

(ii) is offering in Ontario a degree program of study fully accredited by an accrediting agency or association designated by the Minister and recognized by the United States Secretary of Education, and

(iii) files proof with the Minister, if requested, showing that the accrediting agency or association referred to in subclause (ii) has certified that the degree program offered in Ontario meets the same standards that apply to such degree programs offered in the United States of America with respect to admission requirements, curricula, qualifications of faculty, hours of instruction, access to library and laboratory facilities, and requirements for graduation, and

(iv) files proof with the Minister, if requested, showing that the accrediting agency or association referred to in subclause (ii) has conducted a recent inspection of the premises and training facilities where the degree program is offered in Ontario;

OR

(c) a university or degree-granting institution established under the laws of any jurisdiction other than those specified in clauses (a) or (b), and which:

(i) is fully accredited by an accrediting agency or is fully authorized to grant degrees in such jurisdiction and is recognized by the Minister, and

(ii) meets such other requirements as the Minister may prescribe.

2. An institution will be granted a consent only if it can establish that there is evidence of societal need and student demand for the proposed degree program.

3. An institution will be granted a consent only if its Ontario on-site facility and library services are deemed by the Minister to be adequate. With respect to library services, an institution must:

    - provide its own on-site library facility with sufficient resources to meet the demands of the program; or

    - guarantee full access to the home campus library by providing telephone access or comparable technology, bibliographic assistance and the provision of material by mail; or

    - contract with a suitable local library, to deliver full services, including the right to borrow books, to its students; or

    - make other arrangements, combining two or more of the above, that are acceptable.

APPLICATION AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Out-of-province institutions seeking a ministerial consent must submit an application, with the appropriate supporting documentation, to the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

2. The Ontario Council on University Affairs, an advisory body to the Minister of Colleges and Universities, will assess all applications from out-of-province institutions against the criteria outlined in this policy statement and advise the Minister on whether a consent should be granted and any special conditions that may pertain to the granting of such consent.

3. The Minister of Colleges and Universities, based upon the recommendation of the Ontario Council on University Affairs, will make the final decision regarding the granting of consents.

4. Out-of-province institutions receiving a ministerial consent will be required to include a "clarification statement" on all documents relating to the program offered in Ontario. The "clarification statement" is intended to encourage prospective registrants to verify for themselves whether the degree program offered would be recognized by potential employers and/or other post-secondary institutions.

86-II GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM IN 1987-88 AND 1988-89

In this Memorandum, Council sets forth its advice on Government support for the Ontario university system. This advice consists of recommendations on targeted funding for 1987-88 and only on base funding for 1988-89. Recommendations on targeted funding for 1988-89 will be made in the 1987 funding memorandum.

New Initiatives by Government

Council applauds the Treasurer's initiative in providing a two-year funding commitment for basic operating grants. Such a commitment should help facilitate planning in each university by expanding the time horizon for which universities know the level of their basic operating grants. Consequently, Council is altering its approach to funding advice by recommending funding levels to meet the cost of its basic funding objectives for 1988-89 rather than for 1987-88. By making this change, Council acknowledges the commitment by Government to a 4% increase in basic operating grants for 1987-88 and makes no recommendations for grant and fee levels to cover the costs of basic funding objectives for that year. Thus, this advice provides a transition to a two-year funding horizon for base operating grants.

The positive impact on university planning of this two-year commitment to base funding will, however, be significantly reduced by Government's new approach to providing incremental funds through targeted grants which, for the most part, have been announced one year at a time. Council is concerned that this approach is counter-productive to responsible fiscal planning. The notable exception to this is the Faculty Renewal Fund. The substantial multi-year commitment made by Government will enable much that is worthwhile to be accomplished.

Targets for funding must be carefully chosen. Short-term or temporary targets which require on-going commitments to people or programs to sustain the initiatives must not cause a further drain on already insufficient base funding when the targeted funds run out. Council is encouraged by the Government's indication of its agenda for the next decade as expressed in the Speech from the Throne. The Government's commitment "to enabling Ontario universities and colleges to establish their essential place on the path to excellence" is welcome news. But, to a university system already encumbered by years of underfunding, Government has added a weighty burden of expectations. Unable to fulfil its present objectives, the Ontario university system is unlikely to be able to realize the ambitious goals set out for it in the Speech from the Throne without commensurate base funding. It would be irresponsible to ignore base funding problems in favour of short-term objectives.

Council's concern for preserving base funding stems from its goals for the Ontario university system. In 1978, Council outlined in The Ontario University System: A Statement of Issues five goals for the Ontario university system:

(1) to develop a more educated populace;
(2) to educate and train people for the professions;
(3) to provide study at the highest intellectual level;
(4) to conduct basic and applied research including development and evaluation; and
(5) to provide service to the community.[1]

The Speech from the Throne "offers a framework for long-term achievement, rather than a list of short-term promises." It amplifies Council's broad goals for the university system with phrases such as: utilizing "fully and productively the knowledge, ingenuity and skills of our people"; addressing the growing importance of the service sector particularly the "know-how component"; encouraging "basic research, applied research, and technology transfer"; and recognizing Ontario's "leadership role in building a stronger Canada."

Council is convinced that the attainment of these amplified goals continues to be vital to the future economic and social development of the province of Ontario. These are on-going goals which require adequate on-going funding.

In the Speech from the Throne, the Government also indicated a desire to achieve more focused economic or industrial strategy objectives. In this "era of transition" in the world economy, "new advanced industries and sophisticated services offer great opportunity for knowledge workers..." One of the province's "considerable strengths" has been its universities. A knowledge-based economy and inadequate funding of universities is not only contradictory but also self-defeating. It is Council's conviction that an effective response to these new policy directions requires not only adequate funding for specific areas, but also sufficient base funding for the universities of Ontario. Targeting will, in the long run, be ineffective if it is built on a crumbling base. Even the short-term effectiveness of this approach will be severely impaired if institutions do not have sufficient funds to maintain, and indeed enhance, their base expenditures. Thus sustaining and enhancing base funding is an integral part of achieving these objectives in order to have a lasting impact on the economic and social development of the province.

---

[1] These goals were subsequently endorsed by the Government of Ontario, The Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario and the Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario.

Council is not opposed, in principle, to increased targeting of Government grants. Many initiatives may best be promoted by the infusion of funds for specific purposes. However, Council must alert Government to the dangers of too narrow an approach in targeting funds for university education. How can we be certain the targets of today are the opportunities of tomorrow? Does it profit society to accelerate the development of certain specialties while the general education and adaptive skills of the population languish? Can technology be effectively stressed while the humanistic and social context it is meant to serve is ignored? Given these considerations, great care should be given to the choice of targets and the approach to funding them. To ensure the success of initiatives, funding targets must be designed to complement existing or planned approaches for base funding.

In this advisory memorandum, Council provides advice both on the areas and approaches most appropriate for targeted funding for 1987-88 and on the base funding needed for 1988-89.

Government Support in Perspective

On May 26, 1986, the Minister of Colleges and Universities acknowledged in the Legislature that Ontario universities "have suffered deterioration as a result of a decade of chronic underfunding". This deterioration continues in 1986-87. Since Council's funding advice was last accepted in 1977-78, as a result of the cumulative effects of underfunding, base funding has fallen over $175 million short of the funds needed. In the final year of this period, 1986-87, the shortfall in base funding grew by $58.1 million.[2]

Council is conscious of the increasing importance of operating funding provided outside the normal base allocation. Since the Government has moved to increased targeting of operating grants, Council is questioning whether the more appropriate concern would be with the erosion of total operating funding rather than just base funding. While the match of targets recommended by Council and funded by Government may not coincide, it is possible to identify the recommendations and the grants intended for operating activities. The more telling calculation of the erosion in university funding may be the shortfall between the overall operating funds recommended by Council and the total operating grants allocated (targeted and untargeted). Under this approach, the shortfall in funding for total operating activities for 1986-87 equals 18.1 million. This use of total operating income should be confined to the assessment of the erosion of operating funding. Council's calculation of funding needs continues to emphasize the difference between maintenance, restoration and enhancement of funding.

Recognizing the increasing importance of targeted operating funds, Council has taken these funds into consideration in its approach to estimating future basic operating funding needs. It must reiterate, however, that even when these funds are taken into account, Government operating grants fell far short of the needs

---

2. This shortfall between Government support and the universities' basic funding requirements in 1986-87 is based on a recalculation of the cost of Council's basic funding objectives using current estimates of inflation and enrolment change and universities' budgeted revenue available for 1986-87. Incorporated in these recalculations is: 1) an estimate of stable enrolment rather than an enrolment decline of 0.5%, 2) a reduction in the salary inflation estimate from 4.6% to 3.9%, and 3) a reduction in the non-salary inflation estimate from 5.1% to 4.3% (see Appendix A for detailed calculations).

of the Ontario university system in 1986-87. Restrictions on Government funding since 1977-78 have resulted in a growing disparity between the level of service demanded of Ontario universities and the level of resources available to provide that service. Council foresees continued growth in the challenges facing Ontario universities and the demands placed on them. The Speech from the Throne is an excellent example of these increasing expectations. The university system is identified as having a critical role in enabling Ontario to meet the challenges it faces in promoting economic prosperity and social change. Universities will need to increase their efforts in training knowledge workers, providing a bridge to the world of work for young people, providing scientific and technological research and increasing access to future economic and social opportunities. If its own objectives are to be met, Government must make some fundamental decisions with respect to the total funding of the universities of Ontario. Improvements must be made not only for targeted funding, but first and foremost for base funding.

Calculation of Funding Requirements for 1987-88

In the following sections, Council outlines its estimates of the requirements for 1987-88. These estimates include Council's estimates of the funds necessary for the maintenance of operating support (Section A), cyclical renewal of the existing physical plant (Section B), much needed quality restoration (Section C), structural adjustments and special institutional and policy matters of importance to the Ontario university system (Section D), and quality enhancements (Section E).

A. Maintenance of Operating Support

On October 24, 1985, the Treasurer announced that for the year 1987-88 Ontario universities would receive a 4% increase in operating grants to approximately $1,340 million. Council acknowledges this commitment. While not making recommendations on the Government grants and formula fees necessary to meet the cost of Council's basic funding objectives for 1987-88, Council will carry out the calculation in order to show the impact of the 4% commitment on increasing the shortfall in funding, and the continuing importance Council attaches to base funding.

1) Basic Funding Objectives for 1987-88

For 1986-87, Council's basic funding objectives were: 1) to limit the erosion of base funding; 2) to offset inflationary trends; 3) to maintain levels of service; and 4) to adjust for predicted enrolment change. As indicated above, Council now believes that with increased importance being placed on operating funding from outside the normal base funding allocation, the more appropriate concern is with the erosion of total operating funding rather than just base funding. Therefore, Council's first basic funding objective has been modified slightly to reflect this emphasis.

For 1987-88, the basic funding objectives are:

(1) to limit the erosion of operating funding,
(2) to offset inflationary trends,
(3) to maintain levels of service, and
(4) to adjust for predicted enrolment change.

2) Cost of Basic Funding Objectives for 1987-88

The method for costing Council's basic funding objectives for 1987-88 and the factors used for the calculation are outlined in Appendix B. The methodology used for calculating the cost of basic funding objectives differs from last year, reflecting the change by Government to more targeted funding for operating activities. The results are documented in Table B-1 of the Appendix.

Council estimates that to maintain the existing level of service in 1987-88 would, at a minimum, require $1,809.1 million or a 7.8% increase in base funding. This would require $1,397.6 million or an 8.5% increase in basic operating grants (rather than the announced increase of 4%), and an 8.5% increase in formula fee rates. Council urges Government to consider that the 4% increase it has provided is, at a minimum, approximately $58 million short of the universities' needs to maintain their existing "deteriorated" level of service.

B. Cyclical Renewal of Physical Plant

For 1986-87, a total of $43.6 million has been made available in capital grants to Ontario universities. Only $17.8 million of this amount is allocated toward projects covered by Council's 1985-86 capital funding recommendation of $36.1 million for new major repairs, renovations, alterations and replacement projects. The remaining $25.8 million is allocated towards the carry-over costs of existing projects and projects which provide additional space in the universities.

The provision for the on-going cyclical renewal of universities is essential to maintain the capital stock of Ontario universities. It allows for the continuing renewal of the physical plant and the avoidance of crisis management in this area. Major repairs, renovations, alterations and replacement projects can also have a significant impact on job creation in each community in which universities are located, providing employment in the local economy for construction trades and others.

Council continues to use a level of 1% of the value of the space inventory in the university system as the minimum necessary annually for major repairs, renovations, alterations and replacement projects. For 1987-88, the value of this space inventory has been adjusted for inflation by increasing last year's recommendation for capital assistance by 3.5%, the most recent increase in the Non-Residential Building Construction Output Price Index (from the fourth quarter of 1984 to the fourth quarter of 1985).

Accordingly Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-4

LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR MAJOR REPAIRS, RENOVATIONS, ALTERATIONS AND REPLACEMENT PROJECTS IN 1987-88 FOR THE CYCLICAL RENEWAL OF THE EXISTING CAPITAL STOCK

THAT, funds for capital assistance for new major repairs, renovations, alterations and replace-ment projects in 1987-88 be $37.4 million, plus any amount required for carry-overs and essential new construction.

C. Restoration of Quality

Council has been concerned with the effects of underfunding on the quality of university instruction and research for a number of years. The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) recently completed a tour of Ontario universities and information campaign. It concluded:

> ...the Ontario university record of excellence in adversity cannot be maintained for much longer. After a decade of neglect, Ontario universities urgently require additional funding in order to fulfill their critical role in the future economic and intellectual development of this province.[3]

Some of the findings of the tour pointed to the damaging effects of underfunding. The university presidents found:

- some university scientists conduct environmental biology research in a converted beef barn, sharing their quarters with diseased sheep, and storing laboratory supplies in century-old horse stables.
- a fire department report labelled 120 buildings in one university "unsafe fire hazards".
- numerous classrooms are crowded beyond fire marshall's regulations.
- numerous classrooms are so crowded that students are forced to study sitting on the floor or in stairwells.
- some universities have a moratorium on library book purchases.
- one university engineering faculty was in danger of losing its accreditation because of its outdated equipment, until students voted to donate $100 on top of their fees every year to help upgrade it.[4]

It is of critical importance to address the problems that have been created by the deterioration in quality associated with several years of underfunding. In the following sections, Council recommends that additional funding be made available to address a serious and cumulative deterioration in non-salary items - physical plant, equipment and library resources.

---

[3] Council of Ontario Universities, The Tour and Information Campaign, 1986, p. 1.

[4] Ibid., p.5.

1) Deferred Maintenance of Physical Plant

Under the section above, "Cyclical Renewal of Physical Plant", Council recommended that $37.5 million be made available in 1987-88 for the on-going maintenance of the universities' physical plant. This recommendation is based on the belief that throughout the life of the universities' physical plant an equal annual provision (1% of the value of the space inventory) will, on average, provide for adequate maintenance of the capital stock. However, over the past several years Ontario universities have not received the necessary annual allocation to meet their on-going repairs, renovations, alterations and replacement project needs. Council estimates that cumulative shortfall in Government's funding for cyclical renewal from the inception of Council's advice on this matter now equals $205.1 million in 1986 dollars. This level of under-funding for capital renewal has been much more severe than for operating fund activities and represents an increasingly critical priority.

Council's annual recommendations on cyclical capital renewal assume that in every other year of the life of university buildings a similar provision is made. Unlike some operating expenditures where a delay in funding or lack of funding affects only that particular year's operations, a shortfall in capital funding has a cumulative impact on the university's physical plant. In Council's view, if the universities have to continue to defer significant capital maintenance, this will necessitate extraordinarily large outlays of capital assistance in the future. Over the long term these outlays will be much more costly than the annual provision of a reasonable level of funds for repairs, renovations and replacement projects.

In Advisory Memorandum 85-IV Council recommended that $25 million be allocated to begin to address this backlog of deferred maintenance in a systematic manner. This recommendation was rejected. However, Council continues to believe that this critical need must be addressed. Accordingly, as a first step towards addressing this problem, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-5 **LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR DEFERRED MAINTENANCE OF PHYSICAL PLANT IN 1987-88**

THAT, in addition to the amount recommended in 86-4, funds for capital assistance in 1987-88 include, at a minimum, $25 million for deferred repairs, renovations, alterations and replacement projects.

2) Equipment and Library Needs

Council welcomes the initiative undertaken by Government in the University Excellence Fund to provide $25 million for equipment and library purchases in 1986-87. This initiative responds to the concerns Council has expressed for a number of years about the level of funding available for the purchase of equipment and library resources, particularly in the areas of instructional equipment and library acquisitions. These areas have deteriorated significantly over the past eight or nine years.

In Advisory Memorandum 85-IV, Council recommended that $10 million be made available for 1986-87 in order to begin to restore both the stock of equipment and library collections to adequate levels. This recommendation was in addition to the $35 million identified as being necessary for the cyclical renewal of the existing stock of equipment and furniture in Ontario universities. On the one hand, the level of funds provided by Government exceeds Council's special recommendation by $15 million. On the other hand, it ignores the need to make this funding additional to adequate base funding for the normal renewal of these items. In particular, the basic operating grants did not provide sufficient funds for the cyclical renewal and maintenance costs of equipment and furniture identified by Council (approximately $26 million for equipment renewal). The $25 million provided for library enhancement and student equipment cannot be considered to have effectively restored quality in these areas. These funds have gone part way towards providing for a more normal level of equipment renewal and library acquisitions.

For a number of years Council has been concerned with the deterioration of library resources in Ontario universities. In the 1960s and early 1970s Ontario developed significant library resources in its universities. For the past several years, however, they have been seriously eroded. Council believes that as repositories and disseminators of knowledge the libraries of Ontario universities will become an increasingly important "resource" in the knowledge based economy envisioned by Government. It is critical, therefore, to restore library resources to adequate levels.

In its Fall 1985 hearings, Council raised several issues related to recent trends in student computing costs. Many institutions indicated that the demand for student computing will continue to grow and that costs in this area will escalate significantly, requiring increased funding. Concerns for meeting this need are heightened by the fact that the useful life of computer equipment is very short, with much computer hardware becoming obsolete in three to five years. If Ontario universities are to be able to provide students with the skills to function in an "information society", additional resources must be provided to purchase up-to-date equipment and computing facilities. As a beginning, funds must be provided to address the serious backlog of unreplaced obsolete equipment.

The need to redress the serious backlog of unreplaced obsolete equipment and the serious erosion of library resources over past years will remain in 1987-88. The announced 4% increase in basic operating grants will not adequately cover current needs in this area, let alone provide for quality restoration. Additional funds must again be made available for the purchase of equipment and library resources. Given the strains on base funding anticipated, such funding must also provide for the indirect costs of providing these resources as outlined in Advisory Memorandum 85-VIII. Realistically, given the 4% increase in base funding, the funds recommended will not even provide for normal levels of equipment and library acquisitions. Consequently, Council feels strongly that a specific recommendation for additional funding is required to arrest any further deterioration in the stock of equipment and library collections and perhaps begin to restore them to adequate levels. Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-6	**EQUIPMENT AND LIBRARY FUNDING FOR 1987-88**
	THAT, at a minimum, $25.0 million be provided in 1987-88 in recognition of the special need for the restoration of the stock of equipment and library collections.

D. Structural Adjustments and Special Institutional and Policy Matters

Council has identified several structural rigidities or anomalies in the Ontario university system and its funding mechanisms which severely inhibit the universities' flexibility and their ability to respond to new initiatives and meet existing goals for the system. Given the severe constraints on base funding, Council believes it is vital to provide special funding to address these problems and to enhance institutions' abilities to respond to the challenges that face them.

One example of the need for structural adjustment is in the area of the faculty age distribution in the province. Council applauds Government's multi-year commitment to faculty renewal. This initiative will have a significant impact on overcoming the current and future problems inherent in the present faculty age profile. It provides an opportunity to make a commitment to young talented scholars at a time when there are too few retirements to allow these opportunities to be funded from base funding. It will also help reduce the problems of hiring new faculty when the retirement bulge occurs in the future. Council believes that this initiative can have a significant impact on shaping the future of the Ontario university system.

Other areas for which Council makes special recommendations are operating grants allocation adjustments, program adjustments and program specialization.

1) Operating Grants Formula Anomalies

In the past few months Council has undertaken a process of consultation with the university system to develop a new operating grants mechanism. Council has identified the primary direction of change as stabilizing core funding for each institution for several years.

A number of concerns about the current allocation of operating grants in recognizing individual institutional needs have been expressed to Council. These concerns have been heightened by the general degree of underfunding faced by the university system, which has resulted in a lack of flexibility to deal with particular situations within the universities. Council views these concerns as being additional to the overall need to restore quality eroded by years of underfunding.

Council believes that it may be in the public interest to address some of these concerns. At this stage in its deliberations on allocation revision, Council is not able to specify either which anomalies should be adjusted or exactly what level of funding would be required to do so. This can only be done when the final allocation mechanism is developed. Council believes, however, that there are four areas which must be considered for adjustment: research overheads, recent enrolment growth, institutional size and mission, and institutional weights (Ryerson and the Ontario College of Art). These concerns should be addressed only if there are sufficient funds available to support the adjustment. These adjustments should not be made in a zero-sum situation where they result in reductions in funding of other underfunded institutions.

In the case of research overheads, Council believes that if recognition by funding is not given to institutions that have significantly expanded their research activity with little incremental funding, their current level of activity might not be maintained. Council is convinced that it is important to sustain and enhance outstanding university research efforts and would recommend that they not be curtailed at a time when excellence in research should be receiving a high priority. Currently, there is a substantially higher cost associated with being a leading research university in Ontario. Institutions cannot sustain these costs indefinitely without seriously detracting from their activities in other areas. The research excellence found at these institutions should be supported and not be placed in jeopardy.

Similarly, Council believes that if recognition by funding is not given to institutions that have significantly expanded their instructional activities with little incremental funding, levels of enrolment may not be maintained. While Council believes that the demand for university instruction in the next several years will decline only slightly, the demand may not be distributed evenly among the universities. Council is convinced that, if Government's objectives in training "knowledge workers" for new advanced industries and sophisticated services are to be realized, access to high quality university education must be enhanced, not restricted.

While Council is currently unsure of the magnitude of the funding necessary to provide for adjustment for research overheads and recent enrolment growth, projections indicate that it could require an ongoing commitment of between $30 million and $50 million.

In the case of funding adjustments for size, mission and institutional weights, Council must examine the relative cost structures of the institutions involved. It is argued that there are additional costs inherent in small sized institutions or institutions with special-ized missions which require either an uncommonly broad program offering or a restricted program mix. Given the size of these institutions and the incremental nature of the changes likely, Council anticipates that any ongoing funds necessary for these adjustments would be modest.

Any adjustments to correct for current funding anomalies must be on-going and incorporated into the basic operating grants in future years. Short-term funding adjustments will not deal with base funding anomalies.While the final grant value needed to make any of these adjustments will not be known until the long-term operating grants allocative mechanism is determined, Council believes that it would be imperative to begin to phase-in this funding in 1987-88 (the first year for implementing the new allocative mechanism). As a starting point therefore, Council is recommending that an initial amount of $15 million be provided to begin to fund anomalies in 1987-88. Council is certain that the total of any such adjustments will exceed this amount and will be finalized in advice on formula revision later this year.[5]

---

[5] This is similar to recommendation 83-12, where Council recommended additional funds be provided for the incremental costs of existing bilingualism programs on the basis of preliminary information. A final bilingualism cost figure was indicated in Advisory Memorandum 83-IX.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-7 OPERATING GRANTS ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENT FUNDING FOR 1987-88

THAT, at a minimum, $15.0 million be provided in 1987-88, and be incorporated in the basic operating grants in subsequent years, in recognition of the special need for adjusting the allocation of basic operating grants among institutions.

2) Program Adjustment and Specialization

In the Speech from the Throne, Government indicates a need for "determining the areas of specialty universities can master, and the avoidance of unnecessary program duplication". Council has in past considered the concept of rationalization or incentive grants to facilitate program changes at an institution in order to consolidate program offerings. Unlike differentiation grants which are more long-term and recognize that formula income may never be sufficient to allow the institutions to operate in a defined role, these grants were conceived as being relatively short-term to allow certain program changes. To date, rationalization grants have not been used by Council, but could help to achieve the objectives indicated in the Throne Speech.

Another aspect to the funding of program changes is the impact of increased funding stability and reduced funding sensitivity to enrolment change. As indicated above, Council's efforts in the area of operating grants formula revision has led to the conclusion that the allocation of operating grants must become more stable and less sensitive to enrolment change. An outcome of this increased funding stability is that when one institution eliminates a program in order to consolidate its program offerings, there may be insufficient incremental income for another institution with strength in that field to be able to accommodate the displaced students. As a consequence, the university system's capacity in that discipline could be reduced below system needs. Similarly, in new fields which become a provincial priority there may be insufficient funds available to amass the resources required to offer a new program.

Council foresees a need to fund a portion of the costs associated with program closure, program start-up in areas of critical need, moving capacity from one institution to another or initiating co-operative efforts or joint programs in order to facilitate desired program adjustments. The length of commitment should vary from short-term for program closings to more long-term for program openings. Funding for program closures, capacity shifts and joint programs is, in effect, an incentive system to provide more focus for the university enterprise in Ontario. Funding for program start-up in areas of critical need identified by Government or Council is an incentive program for new initiatives. However, in each case a multi-year commitment must be made to phase-in the changes anticipated. Carry-over funding similar to that provided for capital grants should be instituted. Under this arrangement a commitment should be made to fund a particular program adjustment over a period of time and the flow of funds should be identified. Funding recommendations would be on a "new start" basis similar to Council's current approach to capital funding.

Council believes the best way to fund these program adjustments is through a challenge fund. Under such an arrangement, institutions will be able to make proposals for program adjustments and negotiate funding for them. Council and the Minister should also be able to use these funds to provide incentives for program consolidation and specialization as well as new program areas. As a challenge fund, funds not used in any one year for program adjustments should not be allocated to the university system in that year. Council believes that this will provide a significant incentive to institutions to examine and consolidate their program offerings.

At this point, it is difficult to determine the funding necessary to support the types of program adjustment outlined above. Each case should be judged on its own merit. Given the challenge fund approach suggested, any over-estimation of the funds required would revert to Government. Council believes that with experience it will be much easier to assess future funding requirements for new program adjustments as well as carry-overs.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-8 **PROGRAM ADJUSTMENT GRANTS FOR 1987-88**

THAT, $10.0 million be provided in 1987-88 for institutional program adjustments.

3) Estimated Costs of the Bar Admission Course

Council has consistently recommended that Government cover the cost of the grant-in-aid for the Bar Admission Course of the Law Society of Upper Canada separately from its provision for Council's basic funding objectives. This recommendation has not been met. Council continues to believe that such a provision is necessary and desirable. Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-9 **FUNDING FOR 1987-88 FOR THE BAR ADMISSION COURSE**

THAT, $0.8 million be provided in 1987-88 for a grant-in-aid for the Bar Admission course.

E. Quality Enhancements

In addition to restoring the quality of instruction and research which have deteriorated as a result of years of underfunding, Council believes that there is a need for quality enhancement in designated areas. It is Council's view that quality enhancements should build upon existing centres of strength and be highly concentrated in specific fields. Council regards the establishment of centres of excellence as a necessary and worthwhile initiative in this direction.

Centres of Excellence

In the recent Speech from the Throne the Government stated its intention to "encourage the development of centres of excellence in Ontario post-secondary institutions". Council supports such an initiative and believes that concentrating top-ranked intellectual resources in key fields at Ontario universities can lead to a significant improvement in the Province's research efforts.

Council notes with particular interest the intention of the Government to establish a Premier's Council which will direct a $1 billion technology fund (to be allocated over the next decade) to "support, complement and encourage science and technology research in the private sector and post-secondary institutions." One of the principal tasks of the Premier's Council will be to establish "broad provincial priorities in support of critical industries and technologies, to concentrate our resources on areas of specialization and avoid duplication." It is Council's view that the creation of centres of excellence is consistent with this objective and the general directions outlined by Government for the technology fund.

The creation of centres of excellence at Ontario universities can be an important vehicle for coordinating the work of teams of researchers with the activities of the private and public sectors as well as those of universities. Such an initiative can be expected to result in increased research productivity, greater rationalization of resources, improved networking both inside and outside the university and the development of expertise in critical industries and technologies. The concentration of top-ranked competence within specific fields leads to mutual reinforcement and consultation, spin-off of creative ideas and cooperation rather than duplication.

In exploring the concept of centres of excellence Council examined a number of approaches to developing such centres. One such approach recognizes the value of centres of excellence in enhancing collaboration between universities and the private sector on research and development. A recent report of the Corporate-Higher Education Forum entitled "Spending Smarter", examined the success of high-tech communities and research parks as an illustration of how cooperative research advances the objectives of universities and corporations while creating new employment and protecting existing jobs. Specific examples cited in the report of world-renowned centres of technology-driven development include Route 128 (Massachusetts), Silicon Valley (California), the Research Triangle Park in North Carolina and a similar development in Cambridge England. Each of these cases affords an impressive example of job creation arising from technical achievement. The report analyzed the development of these areas and identified the presence of at least one university with an outstanding academic reputation and particular strengths in the applied sciences and engineering as an essential factor if such a centre is to flourish.

While obviously successful in other jurisdictions, a major weakness of this approach when applied to the Canadian setting may lie in the corporate concentration of research and development (R&D) expenditures. Approximately 70% of Canadian corporate R&D expenditures in 1984 was carried out by a handful of large companies. Given that the demand for research and development from the private sector in Canada is low and highly focused among a small number of companies, the potential benefits resulting from this approach may be more limited than that in other countries.

Council consulted with COU and received suggestions with respect to the structure of centres of excellence. One model involves the placing of a centre at one university where a major piece of scientific equipment or a major scientific installation is involved. Such a centre could draw on intellectual resources from across the province. Funds would be required to allow release-time for faculty to work at the centre as well as to provide for infra-structure support and adequate space to accommodate research equipment and the personnel making use of the centre's facilities.

Another approach would be to create a centre of excellence as a focus of intellectual activity rather than in a geographical sense. An example of such an approach is the artificial intelligence program established by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIAR) where the nature of the research is such that it may be undertaken by researchers at different institutions who are linked through their work on a common problem. Resource requirements for this type of centre would involve supporting individual researchers at their own institutions and providing adequate funds to allow the centre to initiate and coordinate these activities. For example, the CIAR assumes the salaries of its fellows as well as the cost of their interaction with other scientists in their respective programs. The approximate value of each new fellowship is $500,000 over a five-year period.

COU also suggested that the establishment of chairs could be viewed as a key ingredient in the development of such centres. In order to attract top-ranked intellectual resources, these chairs would have to provide for adequate research support in terms of staff, equipment and space as well as a substantial salary for the lead person. Given that these chairs must be stable in order to be attractive, a commitment of at least five years would have to be made. Although the precise cost would be dependent largely on the discipline involved, it is estimated that approximately $200,000 annually would be needed to fund one chair. Further, it is estimated that a minimum of $2 million would be necessary to endow one chair.

Council cannot at this time endorse any one approach to creating centres of excellence. However, Council believes that in order to maximize the impact of such an initiative, the importance of building centres of excellence upon existing strengths at Ontario institutions is crucial. It is Council's view that the number of centres must necessarily be few. Their identification will require a considerable knowledge of the university environment. Council believes strongly that a process to identify existing centres of strength upon which to build should tie in with program planning processes already in place. In addition, it is fundamentally important that decisions not be made in isolation from broader considerations of higher education planning.

Although the tone of the Throne Speech suggests the creation of "world class" centres, a preliminary look at existing centres of international calibre in Canada and the United States indicates that excellence on a truly world class level has major funding implications which may not be fully appreciated. For example, Allelix Inc., a Toronto-based biotechnology company, was created in 1982 to develop products and processes related to agriculture, diagnostics and specialty chemicals. A funding commitment of $95 million over 7 years was made by the Canada Development Corporation, John Labatt Limited and the Ontario Development Corporation. Although Allelix claims to have enjoyed significant successes in each of the three areas in which it concentrates, the company has discovered that, in order to realize the market potential of its biotechnological advances and the consequent pay-off in terms of increased jobs and exports, additional funds are required. The experience at Allelix indicates the significant costs involved in launching a free-standing centre of excellence and underscores the importance of utilizing existing resources by building upon identified centres of strength in Ontario universities.

The Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania is regarded by many as a centre of excellence. Wharton joined the handful of schools in the United States offering both an undergraduate and MBA major in entrepreneurship. Supporting excellence, even in non-resource intensive areas such as business, is a costly undertaking. For example, in 1985 alone, the Wharton School of Business established 6 endowed chairs at $1.5 million (U.S.) each, hired 58 new faculty members, boosted faculty pay (in order to remain competitive), and initiated a $5 million fund for seed money for student enterprises to support its entrepreneurial focus. All of these enhancements have been added to what is already viewed as a centre of considerable strength.

Research is expensive. The 1985 research and development budgets of Bell Labs (U.S.) and Bell Northern Research (Canada) equal $1,900 million (U.S.) and $657.7 million respectively. If the intention is to achieve levels of excellence referred to in the examples above, resources far in excess of those indicated so far by Government would be required.

Council is of the opinion that funds made available to create centres of excellence must be highly concentrated and specifically focused. There have been numerous reports by organizations in both the public and private sector which have documented Canada's comparatively low R&D investment levels. Canada's spending levels have been consistently lower than the levels in other developed countries. Given the meager emphasis Canada places on R&D in general, effort should be made to build upon existing strengths and concentrate our intellectual and financial resources in niches identified as being of vital importance to Ontario's economic and social development.

In light of the above considerations, Council believes that an expert knowledge of the strengths and capabilities of the Ontario university system, its research enterprise and private sector R&D needs, is essential to determining the establishment of centres of excellence. While the Throne Speech indicates that the Premier's Council will have responsibility for determining the priority areas in which these centres should concentrate, the complex task of identifying existing strengths and structuring the centres should be undertaken by a separate group.

Council reiterates its support for the concept of Centres of Excellence. It is Council's view that creating centres of excellence by building upon existing strengths at Ontario institutions and enhancing cooperation between universities and industry on research and development will address goals outlined by Government in the Throne Speech. Such an initiative has the potential to meet the needs for innovation and progress of the province's research community while serving as a tool of economic development. Formal advice with respect to centres of excellence is not contained within this memorandum, however, Council would be prepared to submit more detailed advice in the future.

Calculation of Funding Requirements for 1988-89

Council will provide its funding advice for 1988-89 in two advisory memoranda. To facilitate a two-year funding horizon for base funding, Council provides in the following sections its estimate of the funds required for the maintenance of operating support for 1988-89. Council will provide its advice on the funds needed in 1988-89 for cyclical renewal of physical plant, restoration of quality, structural adjustments and special institutional and policy matters and quality enhancement in its 1987 funding memorandum.

1) Basic Funding Objectives for 1988-89

Council's basic funding objectives for 1988-89 are:

1) to limit the erosion of operating funding,
2) to offset inflationary trends,
3) to maintain levels of service, and
4) to adjust for predicted enrolment change.

2) Cost of Basic Funding Objectives for 1988-89

The method for costing Council's basic funding objectives for 1988-89 and the factors used to calculate the funds required are outlined below. Table 1 documents the results. The methodology used for

TABLE 1

THE COST OF BASIC FUNDING OBJECTIVES FOR 1988-89
($ MILLION)

Expenditures	1 1987-88 Base	2 Base Adjustment	3 Inflationary Trend Costs	4 Service Level Costs	5 Predicted Enrolment Change	6 Stabilization Factor	7 Cost of Basic Objectives
Salaries and Fringe Benefits	1,380.5	14.4	55.8	20.3	(7.4)	3.7	1,467.3
Non-Salary	358.2	3.7	16.8	36.6	(2.1)	1.1	414.3
TOTAL	1,738.7	18.1	72.6	56.9	(9.5)	4.8	1,881.6

Notes:
1. Factors for each column of the table are as follows:

	Salaries and Fringe Benefits	Non-Salary
Column 2:	$14.4 million	$3.7 million
Column 3:	4.0%	4.7%
Column 4:	1.4%	$36.6 million
Column 5:	- 0.5%	- 0.5%
Column 6:	- 50.0% of Column 5	- 50.0% of Column 5

2. The above percentage change factors, except for Column 5, are applied to the cummulative total of the previous columns.

calculating the cost of basic funding objectives is similar to that outlined in Appendix B for 1987-88.

(i) The 1987-88 Base (Column 1)

Council's estimate of the basic financial requirements of the Ontario university system for 1988-89 is calculated by escalating the universities' estimated expenditures in 1987-88 by two factors: (a) Council's estimate of the erosion in operating funding from 1985-86 to 1986-87, and (b) Council's estimate of the cost of maintaining the resulting level of service. In calculating the 1987-88 expenditure, it is assumed that expenditures in 1987-88 will be equal to estimated revenues. The details of this calculation are found in Appendix C.

On this basis, Council estimates that the 1987-88 base of operating revenue and expenditures of all institutions (the fifteen provincially-assisted universities, the affiliated colleges, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario College of Art and Dominican College) will be $1,738.7 million. The 1987-88 base expenditures are apportioned according to their corresponding share in the universities' budgets; 79.4% for salaries and fringe benefits and 20.6% for non-salary items.

ii) Base Adjustment (Column 2)

Following the approach adopted in Appendix B for estimating the cost of basic funding objectives for 1987-88, Council includes a base adjustment factor in its 1988-89 funding model. Since, at the present time, only base operating grants are known for 1987-88, it is not possible to estimate the shortfall, if any, in total operating support for 1987-88. Council, therefore, proposes to "slip" the base adjustment by one year. In column 2 of Table 1, the 1987-88 base is adjusted by the 1986-87 shortfall in total operating support. This adjustment factor is the same as that calculated in Appendix B. The resulting $18.1 million is apportioned between salary and non-salary expenditures according to each category's share of base budgets.

iii) Increases in Costs due to Inflation (Column 3)

Council has reviewed forecasts made by several competent authorities of the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Council has deep reservations, however, about inflation forecasts beyond one year in length and is hesitant to place much emphasis on long-term forecasts. Council uses a figure of 4.0% as its salary inflation factor, resulting in an estimated $55.8 million in additional salaries and benefits. While this factor represents Council's "best guess" at this time, if inflationary change varies significantly in the next two years such variance should be incorporated in the cost of basic objectives.

In the past five years the annual increase in the Ontario University Non-Salary Price Index averaged 16.3% higher than the annual increase in CPI. Council's 1988-89 non-salary inflation factor is derived by increasing the projected 4.0% increase in CPI by the average differential between the increase in OUNSPI and CPI for this period. This yields a value of 4.7%, resulting in an estimated $16.8 million in non-salary inflation costs.

iv) Increase in Costs of Maintaining Existing Service Levels (Column 4)

a) Salary-related Service Level Costs

Council's 1988-89 provision for meeting the salary-related costs of maintaining levels of service is a consequence of the uneven age distribution of the faculty and staff complement which in turn generates a net cost in providing for progress-through-the-ranks (PTR). This net cost results from the situation where the number of people returning (with higher salaries) and being replaced by younger people (with lower salaries), is not sufficient to provide the total funds required for the normal progress of continuing faculty and staff. The faculty manpower flow model developed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) predicts that, for the existing age distribution of faculty, the net costs of providing for PTR in 1988-89 will be 1.4% of salaries and benefits. This results in an additional $20.3 million in PTR costs.

(b) Non-Salary Service Level Costs

In its 1986-87 funding advice, Council adopted a 12-year replacement cycle for equipment and furniture stocks. This was done after an extensive review of private sector and university replacement procedures. For 1988-89 Council escalates its 1987-88 estimate found in Appendix B by its 1988-89 non-salary inflation factor outlined above. Council, therefore, estimates that in 1988-89 an additional $36.6 million must be made available for the cyclical replacement of equipment and furniture.

v) Projected Change in Enrolment (Column 5)

Council has reviewed COU's Committee on Enrolment Statistics and Projections long-run enrolment estimates, trends in the size of cohort (18-24 years of age) from which universities will draw the majority of students, recent trends in participation rates, and recent data on retention rates and the consequent flow-through of enrolment in upper years in 1988-89. On the basis of this information, Council estimates that enrolment in the university system in Ontario will decline by 0.5% in 1988-89.

vi) Funding Stabilization (Column 6)

In order to dampen the effect of enrolment change in any one year on the level of funding, Council, for a number of years, has discounted by 50% the projected growth or decline in enrolment used in its funding advice. Council continues to use this discount factor for 1988-89. Taking into account the level of enrolment change predicted in Column 4 (-0.5%) for 1988-89 and applying the 50% enrolment discount factor adds $4.8 million to the funding model.[6]

---

[6] The reduction in enrolment costs of $9.5 million associated with the 0.5% decline in enrolment, discounted by 50% under the stabilization factor ($4.8 million), results in a net decline in enrolment-related costs of $4.7 million.

vii) Total Cost of Basic funding Objectives
(Column 7)

The total cost of basis funding objectives in Column 7 of Table 1 is the sum of the first six columns. Council's estimate of the total cost of basic funding objectives for 1988-89 is $1,881.6 million - an 8.2% increase over the 1987-88 estimated expenditure base.

Estimated Government Grants Required to meet the Basic Funding Objectives

Council estimates that the other income accruing to the university system in 1988-89, in addition to Government grants, will be:

i) from other sources, $70.6 million, the same as the amount projected for 1987-88;
ii) from fees other than tuition fees, $26.4 million, the 1987-88 projection adjusted for the projected 0.5% decline in enrolment in 1988-89; and
iii) from formula tuition fees, $300.8 million at 1987-88 fee rates including an adjustment for the predicted 0.5% decrease in enrolment in 1988-89.

Consistent with Council's advice on formula fee rates in Advisory Memorandum 79-IV, formula fee rates are increased by the same percentage as operating grants. Therefore, formula fee rates and Government grants should be increased by 8.8%. As shown in Table 2, Council estimates that of the total $1,881.6 million required, $1,457.3 million must be made available as Government operating grants to meet the costs of Council's basic funding objectives in 1988-89.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister and Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

OCUA 86-10 **GOVERNMENT OPERATING GRANTS FOR 1988-89 TO MEET THE COST OF COUNCIL'S BASIC OBJECTIVES IN FUNDING PROVINCIALLY-ASSISTED UNIVERSITIES AND THEIR AFFILIATED COLLEGES, RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE, THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION, THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF ART AND DOMINICAN COLLEGE**

THAT, $1,457.3 million in basic operating grants be made available in 1988-89 to the provincially-assisted universities and their affiliated colleges, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario College of Art and Dominican College.

OCUA 86-11 **FORMULA FEE RATES FOR 1988-89 TO MEET THE COST OF COUNCIL'S BASIC OBJECTIVES**

THAT, formula fee rates for 1988-89 be increased by the same percentage as operating grants, namely 8.8 %, to provide $327.3 million in formula fee revenue to the provincially-assisted universities and their affiliated colleges, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario College of Art and Dominican College, and that this increase in formula fee rates be fully reflected in the Ontario Student Assistance Program.

Conclusion

While funding was increased for 1986-87, the amount continued to fall short of that recommended by Council and needed by Ontario universities. It is Council's conviction that the funds recommended in the memorandum and summarized in Table 3 are the minimum required to ensure that quality does not decline further and that needed initiatives are undertaken. Council will provide further funding advice on targeted grants for 1988-89 in its 1987 funding memorandum.

M. Paikin
Chairman

June 20, 1986

TABLE 2

Cost to Government of Meeting Council's Basic Funding Objectives for 1988-89: Provincially-Assisted Universities, Affiliated Colleges, Ryerson OISE, OCA and Dominican College

($ million)

1. Cost of Basic Funding Objectives	1,881.6
2. Other Revenue	(70.6)
3. Other Fee Revenue	(26.4)
4. Total Formula Fees and Government Operating Grants required to meet Council's Basic Funding Objectives	1,784.6
5. Formula Fee Revenue at 1987-88 rates and the predicted 1988-89 level of enrolment	300.8
6. Estimated 1987-88 Operating Grants	1,339.2
7. Estimated 1987-88 Operating Grants and enrolment-adjusted Formula Fee Revenue (line 5 + line 6)	1,640.0
8. Percentage increase in Operating Grants and Formula Revenue $\frac{(\text{line 4 - line 7})}{\text{line 7}} \text{ X } 100$	8.8%
9. Additional Formula Fee Revenue generated by an 8.8% increase in formula fee rates	26.5
10. Total formula Fee Revenue (line 5 + line 9)	327.3
11. Cost to Government of Basic Funding Objectives (line 6 increased by 8.8%)	1,457.3

Table 3
Summary of Grant Recommendations
($ million)

1987-88

A. Maintenance of Basic Operating Support (announced 4% increase would be an estimated $1,339.2 million)	
B. Cyclical Renewal of Physical Plant	37.5
C. Quality Restoration	
1) Deferred Maintenance of Capital Stock	25.0
2) Equipment and Library Needs	25.0
D. Structural Adjustments and Special Institutional and Policy Matters	
1) Operating grants formula anomalies	15.0
2) Program Adjustment and Specialization	10.0
3) Grant-in-aid for the Bar Admission Course	0.8
Total Grants Recommended	113.3
(This would provide $1,452.2 milion in total grants for 1987-88)	

1988-89

A. Maintenance of Basic Operating Support	1,457.3
(Targeted funding for cyclical renewal of physical plant, quality restoration, structural adjustments and special institutional and policy matters, and quality enhancements will be recommended in Council's 1987 funding memorandum.)	

Appendix A

Revised Calculation of Shortfall in Funding for 1986-87

The estimate of the basic funding requirements for 1986-87 contained in Advisory Memorandum 85-VIII has been revised to reflect up-dated estimates of CPI and enrolment change. The inflation factors for salary and non-salary items have declined from 4.6% and 5.1% to 3.9% and 4.3% respectively. Enrolment change projections have been changed from a decline of 0.5% to 0.0%. As a result, the revised estimate of the cost of basic funding objectives in 1986-87 is $1,735.8 million.

The estimate of total funds available to the Ontario university system has also been revised to reflect up-dated information on government grants, fees and other income. Council now estimates that total fee income (formula tuition and other fees) will be $319.4 million in 1986-87. Government operating grants will total $1,287.7 million (not including those funds provided for operating expenditures that are not part of the cost of basic objectives: $0.794 million for the grant-in-aid to the Bar Admission Course, $10 million for faculty renewal, $15 million for research leadership and $25.0 million for library enhancement and student equipment). Other revenue is estimated to be $70.6 million in 1986-87. Thus, the total estimated revenue available to the system is $1,677.7 million.

The revised estimate of the shortfall in revenue compared to expenditures required to meet the basic funding objectives is $58.1 million ($1,735.8 - $1,677.7 million).

Council's estimate of total operating funding needs for 1986-87 is the sum of the revised estimate of the cost of basic funding objectives ($1,735.8 million) and $10.0 million for equipment and library needs. This equals $1,745.8 million.

The estimate of the total operating funds available for 1986-87 is the sum of the estimate of the funds available for the cost of basic funding objectives ($1,677.7 million) and $50.0 million allocated for the University Excellence Fund ($10 million for faculty renewal, $15 million for research leadership and $25 million for library enhancement and student equipment). This equals $1,727.7 million.

Council estimates that the shortfall in total operating revenue compared to total operating expenditures for 1986-87 is $18.1 million ($1,745.8-$1,727.7 million).

TABLE A-1

Revised Operating Funding Shortfall for 1986-87
($ million)

Council's Revised Recommendations		
Cost of Basic Funding Objectives (A)	1,735.8	
Additional Grants Recommended Equipment and library needs		10.0
Total Operating Needs (B)		1,745.8
Estimated Revenues Available		
Revenue Available for the Cost of Basic Funding Objectives (C)	1,677.7	
Additional Operating Grants Available		
University Excellence Fund:		
Faculty Renewal		10.0
Research Leadership		15.0
Library Enhancement and Student Equipment		25.0
Estimated Total Operating Revenue Available (D)		1,727.7
Shortfall on Funds Available		
Funds available for the cost of Basic Funding Objectives (A-C)	58.1	
Funds available for Total Operating Needs (B-D)		18.1

Appendix B

Cost of Basic Funding Objectives for 1987-88

i) The 1986-87 Base (Column 1)

Council's estimate of the basic financial requirements of the Ontario university system for 1987-88 is calculated by escalating the universities' expenditures in 1986-87 by two factors: (a) Council's estimate of the erosion in total operating funding from 1985-86 to 1986-87, and (b) Council's estimate of the costs of maintaining the resulting level of service. In calculating the 1986-87 expenditure base, it is assumed that expenditures in 1986-87 will be equal to estimated revenues.

On this basis, Council estimates that the 1986-87 base of operating revenue and expenditures of all institutions will be $1,677.7 million. The 1986-87 base expenditures are apportioned according to their corresponding share in the universities' budgets: 79.4% for salaries and fringe benefits and 20.6% for non-salary items.

ii) Base Adjustment (Column 2)

In last year's funding advice, Council introduced a base adjustment factor to ensure that the funding base used in its cost of basic funding objectives model was not further eroded. Prior to this, Council's estimates of the financial requirements of the Ontario university system were calculated by escalating the universities' operating expenditures in the previous year by Council's estimate of the increase in the costs of maintaining the same level of service. This approach did not question the adequacy of funding in the previous year, ignoring that year's and prior year's shortfalls in funding and in effect "wiping the slate clean" each year. The result was that, prior to last year, Council's estimates of the cost of basic funding objectives had a built-in and compounded understatement of the needs of Ontario universities.

Council remains convinced of the need to halt the erosion in university funding. As indicated above, Council believes that with the advent of increased targeting of operating grants, the shortfall calculations should appropriately encompass total operating grants and not just base operating grants. Council alters the focus of its base adjustment for the 1986-87 base to cover the erosion of total operating funding rather than base funding as used in last year's advice. Council places in Column 2 an adjustment to the 1986-87 base that reflects the erosion of operating funding which occurred from 1985-86 to 1986-87. This adjustment factor is the same factor calculated above (under "Government Support in Perspective") as the shortfall in Government's meeting total operating expenditure needs. This $18.1 million estimate is apportioned between salary and non-salary expenditures according to each category's share of base budgets.

iii) **Increases in Costs due to Inflation** (Column 3)

Council has reviewed forecasts made by several competent authorities of the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for 1987-88. These projections ranged from 2.4% to 6.3%. Council has chosen a factor of 3.8%, as its estimate of the increase in CPI. Council uses this estimate of the increase in CPI as its salary inflation factor, resulting in an estimated $51.2 million in additional salaries and benefits.

Council's 1987-88 non-salary inflation factor is derived by increasing the projected 3.8% increase in CPI by the average differential between the increase in OUNSPI and CPI for the past five years (16.3%). This yields a value of 4.4%, resulting in an estimated $15.2 million in non-salary inflation costs.

iv) **Increase in Costs of Maintaining Existing Service Levels** (Column 4)

(a) Salary-related Service Level Costs

Council's 1987-88 provision for meeting the salary-related costs of maintaining levels of service provides for the net cost of progress-through-the-ranks (PTR) of faculty and staff at Ontario universities. The faculty manpower flow model developed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) predicts that, for the existing age distribution of faculty, the net costs of providing for PTR in 1987-88 will be 1.5% of salaries and benefits.

This results in an additional $21.0 million in PTR costs.

(b) Non-Salary Service Level Costs

Council uses a combined 12-year replacement cycle for equipment and furniture. Last year, COU valued the existing stock at $1,070 million. When increased by the most recent percentage change in OUNSPI it is valued at $1,163.1 million. Expenditure information provided by the institutions for 1985-86 and budgeted for 1986-87 suggests that institutions can be expected to spend between $50.0 million and $60.0 million in 1987-88 on equipment and furniture purchases and rentals from traditional sources of income covering the costs of basic funding objectives. Council, therefore, estimates that in 1987-88 an additional $35.0 million must be made available for the cyclical replacement of equipment and furniture.

v) **Projected Change in Enrolment** (Column 5)

In 1985-86, total university enrolment decreased by about 0.7%. COU's Committee on Enrolment Statistics and Projections estimates that enrolment will remain at the same level in 1985-86. Council has considered this forecast together with:

(a) the most recent data on the number of visa and domestic student applications for first year admission in the fall of 1986.
(b) trends in the size of the cohort (18-24 years of age) from which universities will draw the majority of students;
(c) recent trends in participation rates; and
(d) recent data on retention rates and the consequent flow-through of enrolment in upper years in 1987-88.

On the basis of this information, Council estimates that enrolment in the university system in Ontario will decline by 1.0% in 1987-88. When applied to Council's funding model this yields a reduction of $18.3 million.

vi) **Funding Stabilization Factor** (Column 6)

In order to dampen the effect of enrolment change in any one year on the level of funding, Council, for a number of years, has discounted by 50% the projected growth or decline in enrolment used in its funding advice. Council continues to use this discount factor for 1987-88. Taking into account the level of enrolment change predicted in Column 5 (-1.0%) for 1987-88 and applying the 50% enrolment discount factor adds $9.2 million to the funding model.

vii) **Total Cost of Basic Funding Objectives** (Column 7)

The total cost of basic funding objectives in Column 7 of Table B-1 is the sum of the first six columns. Council's estimate of the total cost of basic funding objectives for 1987-88 is $1,809.1 million - a 7.8% increase over the 1986-87 estimated expenditure base.

Estimated Government Grants Required to meet the Basic Funding Objectives

Council estimates that the other income accruing to the university system in 1987-88, in addition to Government grants, will be:

i) from other sources, $70.6 million, the same as the amount projected for 1986-87;
ii) from fees other than tuition fees, $25.2 million, the 1986-87 projection adjusted for the projected 1.0% decline in enrolment in 1987-88; and
iii) from formula tuition fees, $290.7 million at 1986-87 fee rates including an adjustment for the predicted 1.0% decrease in enrolment in 1987-88.

Consistent with Council's advice on formula fee rates in Advisory Memorandum 79-IV, formula fee rates are increased by the same percentage as operating grants. Therefore, formula fee rates and Government grants should be increased by 8.5%. This calculation is shown in Table B-2.

Council estimates that of the total $1,809.1 million required, $1,397.6 million must be made available as Government operating grants to meet the costs of Council's basic funding objectives in 1987-88. The announced 4% increase in base operating grants will provide approximately $1,339.2 million. This falls $58.4 million short of the grants needed.

TABLE B-1

THE COST OF BASIC FUNDING OBJECTIVES FOR 1987-88
($ MILLION)

Expenditures	1 1986-87 Base	2 Base Adjustment	3 Inflationary Trend Costs	4 Service Level Costs	5 Predicted Enrolment Change	6 Stabilization Factor	7 Cost of Basic Objectives
Salaries and Fringe Benefits	1,332.1	14.4	51.2	21.0	(14.2)	7.1	1,411.6
Non-Salary	345.6	3.7	15.2	35.0	(4.1)	2.1	397.5
TOTAL	1,677.7	18.1	66.4	56.0	(18.3)	9.2	1,809.1

Notes:

1. Factors for each column of the table are as follows:

	Salaries and Fringe Benefits	Non-Salary
Column 2:	$14.4 million	$3.7 million
Column 3:	3.8%	4.4%
Column 4:	1.5%	$35 million
Column 5:	-1.0%	-1.0%
Column 6:	- 50.0% of Column 5	- 50.0% of Column 5

2. The above percentage change factors, except for Column 5, are applied to the cumulative total of the previous columns.

TABLE B-2

Cost to Government of Meeting Council's Basic Funding Objectives for 1987-88: Provincially-Assisted Universities, Affiliated Colleges, Ryerson, OISE, OCA and Dominican College

($ million)

1. Cost of Basic Funding Objectives	1,809.1
2. Other Revenue	(70.6)
3. Other Fee Revenue	(25.5)
4. Total Formula Fees and Government Operating Grants required to meet Council's Basic Funding Objectives	1,713.0
5. Formula Fee Revenue at 1986-87 rates and the predicted 1987-88 level of enrolment	290.7
6. 1986-87 Operating Grants	1,287.7
7. 1986-1987 Operating Grants and enrolment -adjusted Formula Fee Revenue (line 5 + line 6)	1,578.4
8. Percentage increase in Operating Grants and Formula Fee Revenue $\frac{(\text{line 4 - line 7})}{\text{line 7}} \times 100$	8.5%
9. Additional Formula Fee Revenue generated by an 8.5% increase in formula fee rates	24.7
10. Total Formula Fee Revenue (line 5 + line 9)	315.4
11. Cost to Government of Basic Funding Objectives (line 6 increased by	1,397.6

Appendix C

The 1986-87 and 1987-88 Bases

This appendix outlines the derivation of the 1986-87 and 1987-88 bases used in Council's funding exercise. For the purpose of this exercise, Council assumes that system expenditures in both years will equal total revenue, and estimates total operating revenue at $ 1,677.7 million in 1986-87 and $1,738.7 million in 1987-88. Table C - 1 provides details of 1986-87 and 1987-88 revenues by type.

Formula and Non-Formula Grants

The figure $1,287.7 million for 1987-87 found in Table C - 1 is derived by subtracting $5.29 million in line-item grants and $0.794 million to be used for the grant-in-aid to the Bar Admission Course from the $1,293.76 million in operating grants for 1986-87 announced by the Minister on October 25, 1985. The 1987-88 figure of $1,339.2 million is equal to the 1986-87 figure escalated by the announced 4% increase in basic operating grants for 1987-88.

Formula and Other Fees

In each year, Council's funding base includes only that fee revenue which is derived from formula fees and other fees. Any revenue accruing to the universities as a result of the application of their discretionary tuition fee power has been excluded from the base. The 1986-87 formula fee revenue is estimated to equal $293.6 million. This is calculated by applying the 1986-87 formula fee rates to 1985-86 enrolment. This figure also includes an estimate of supplementary foreign fee revenue and third-term graduate formula fees. The other fee revenue estimate of $25.8 million was based on the universities' budget reports for 1986-87.

The 1987-88 formula fee revenue of $302.3 million is calculated by escalating the 1986-87 formula fee revenue estimate by 4% and Council's estimated 1987-88 change in enrolment (0.0%). The 1987-88 other fee of $26.6 million is calculated in the same manner. The 1986-87 budget data have been escalated by 4% and reduced by the estimated 1% decline in enrolment.

Other Revenue

Other revenue for 1986-87 includes Ministry line-item grants of $5.29 million and an estimated $65.3 million in other sources of income. The latter amount was derived from the universities' reports on budgeted revenue for 1986-87. Other revenue is assumed to remain unchanged in 1987-88.

TABLE C - 1
University System Revenue
($ million)

	1986-87 Estimate	1987-88 Estimate
Formula and Non-Formula Grants*	$1,287.7	$1,339.2
Formula Fees	293.6	302.3
Other Fees	25.8	26.6
Other Revenue**	70.6	70.6
Total	$1,677.7	$1,738.7

* Excludes Ministry line-item grants and Bar Admission Course grant-in-aid.

** Includes Ministry line-item grants.

86-III AN ASSESSMENT OF THE COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES' PROGRAM QUALITY APPRAISALS PROCESS

Council recently commissioned a review of the Appraisals Process which is operated by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies under the auspices of the Council of Ontario Universities. Three assessors were asked to examine and comment on the integrity of the Appraisals Process and the results of their assessment are contained in Appendix A.

Council has reviewed the assessors' report and, upon the recommendation of its Academic Advisory Committee, accepts the assessors' finding that the Appraisals Process currently in place produces reliable and credible judgements of the academic quality of existing and proposed graduate programs in Ontario universities. Further, Council concurs with the advice of the Academic Advisory Committee that, since the existing process which has been in place for some time is working well, any future review should be initiated by Council on its own or on the recommendation of the Committee. With respect to the timing of such a review, the present guidelines contained in the Committee's terms of reference seem most appropriate. The report to Council from the Academic Advisory Committee and the response of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies to the assessors' report are contained in Appendices B and C, respectively.

Council believes that the assessors' observations provide opportunities for further study by Council and the universities on matters relating to graduate program planning and funding.

M. Paikin
Chairman

June 20, 1986

APPENDIX A

REPORT TO THE ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS ON AN ASSESSMENT OF THE APPRAISALS PROCESS

J. Stefan Dupré
George A. Harrower
Marc-Adélard Tremblay

Introduction

By letter of November 5, 1985, from Mrs. M. Paikin, Chairman of the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA), we were constituted a Committee to conduct an assessment of the Appraisals Process which is operated by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) under the auspices of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). In particular, we were asked to express an opinion concerning the integrity and credibility of this process.

The over-all finding of this Committee is that, in our unanimous and unqualified opinion, the Appraisals Process which is currently in place produces reliable and credible judgements of the academic quality of existing and proposed graduate programs in Ontario.

This Report is divided into three parts. The first part situates the Appraisals Process in the broader context of the general procedures whereby graduate programs are deemed eligible or ineligible for public funding, and then offers a description of the manner in which the Appraisals Process operates. The second part outlines the tests we applied in order to probe the integrity and credibility of the Appraisals Process and then presents the specific findings on which we base our opinion that this Process is reliable and credible. Given these over-all findings, the third part offers various observations, some devoted to the manner in which individual institutions can more effectively support the operation of the Appraisals Process, others directed to the opportunities that this reliable and credible process generates. These opportunities are available to OCUA and its emanations, COU and its emanations, and the universities, all of whom are responsible to present and

---

Note: The original report contained two appendices which have been omitted here.

future generations for the quality, range and effectiveness of what is by far the largest and most varied graduate studies enterprise in Canada.

I. THE APPRAISALS PROCESS

Context

The Appraisals Process forms part of a broader process pursuant to which the graduate programs offered by Ontario universities are deemed eligible or ineligible for public funding. The actual funding decision is made by the Minister of Colleges and Universities who takes guidance from the formal advice of OCUA.

OCUA stipulates that it will base its advice concerning the funding eligibility of any new graduate programs proposed by a university on the following criteria:

1. That the program has passed a rigorous academic appraisal, as certified by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), and at the time of appraisal was not found to require improvements.
2. That there is evidence of societal need and student demand for the program in Ontario and/or Canada.
3. That the proposed program does not duplicate an existing program in Ontario unless the institution proposing the new program demonstrates to Council's satisfaction that exceptional circumstances obtain, such that Council should recommend the program for funding despite the duplication involved.
4. That the program is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the institution offering the program, and is included in the institution's five-year plan.
5. That the program is deserving of funding even in a time of economic constraint.[1]

---

[1] OCUA, Tenth Annual Report, 1983-84, p. 72.

Pertaining as it does to the first of these five criteria, the Appraisals Process constitutes the threshold that each new graduate program must cross before it can be measured against the remaining criteria. Once a new program has been submitted to OCUA as having been favourably appraised, it will be scrutinized by OCUA's Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) with respect to the second, third and fourth criteria. AAC must deem that the program has met each of these criteria to trigger the possibility of a favourable funding recommendation from OCUA. This possibility hinges in turn on whether the program meets the fifth criterion, a judgement which OCUA reserves to itself.

In addition to constituting the initial threshold that every new program must cross before being measured against the second through the fifth of OCUA's funding criteria, the Appraisals Process provides, with respect to existing graduate programs, the test that each such program must meet in order to merit continued public funding. All existing graduate programs are subject to periodic appraisals which are scheduled to recur, discipline by discipline (or in the case of multidisciplinary programs, cognate area by cognate area), every seven years. In the wake of a periodic appraisal, each graduate program is assigned to one of four categories:

Category "a": Programs that have achieved a level of good quality and which are expected to retain that level of quality over the next seven year period.

Category "b": Programs that have achieved a level of good quality at the time of the appraisal, but for which it was expected that problems would develop before the next seven-year review, for example, due to retirements of senior faculty. Such programs are approved to continue but the university is asked to submit a report, normally within two to four years, on the steps it has taken to maintain the quality.

Category "c": Programs that require minor improvements to meet the quality standard. Such programs receive conditional approval at the time of appraisal and full approval when the Appraisals Committee is satisfied that the improvements have been made.

Category "d": Programs that fail to meet the quality standard. Such programs require major improvements to achieve the required level, such as the addition of a number of new faculty or significant new library or laboratory resources. The university will cease admitting students to the program until it has been successfully reappraised.[2]

It is the practice of OCUA to recommend to the Minister that public funding be withdrawn from any graduate program appraised as falling in Category "d". Universities may exercise the option of withdrawing a program from the Appraisals Process before the program has been assigned to a particular Category. Again, it is the practice of OCUA to recommend that public funding be withdrawn from any such program. In the result, these twin OCUA practices mean that, to remain eligible for public funding, every graduate program must be assigned to a Category by the Appraisals Process, and the category to which it is assigned must be other than Category "d". Once deemed ineligible for public funding, either because it was assigned to Category "d" or withdrawn from the Appraisals Process, a graduate program can again be recognized as eligible for funding only if it is resubmitted by its sponsoring university as a new program, and satisfies all five of the OCUA criteria applicable to new programs.

Categories "b" and "c" are deemed to be temporary Categories. The Appraisals Process requires each university to report upon any of its programs that have been placed in these Categories. If the concerns that caused a program to be placed in Category "b" or "c" have been met, the program will be placed in Category "a". If not, the program will be placed in Category "d".

Clearly, when viewed in the context pursuant to which new and existing graduate programs are deemed eligible or ineligible for public funding, the role of the Appraisals Process is pivotal.

---

[2] OCUA, Eleventh Annual Report, 1984-85, p. 184. Since the time these Categories were described by OCUA in this Annual Report, there have been minor changes in wording but these do not materially affect their meaning or application.

Operation

The key body in the operation of the Appraisals Process is the Appraisals Committee of OCGS, the graduate studies arm of COU. The Appraisals Committee consists of twenty-one members of the Ontario university professoriate appointed by OCGS to serve three-year terms of office. The membership of the Committee is selected by an OCGS nominating committee so as to be broadly representative of the fifteen Ontario universities and of the four main divisions of graduate study: the humanities, the social sciences, the physical sciences and the life sciences. The OCGS nominating committee makes its selection from among candidates recommended by the graduate deans (or equivalent officers) of the universities. The suitability of candidates is assessed, on the basis of their curriculum vitae, with particular attention to their scholarly attainment and their familiarity, gained through committee or administrative experience, with the scholarly enterprise.

So as to manage the enormous volume of documents and decisions that constitute its workload, the 21-member Appraisals Committee never sits en banc but instead operates in three distinct seven-member Sections. Each Section exercises the full responsibility and authority that are vested in the Appraisals Committee. Any reference in this Report to the work of the Appraisals Committee is in fact a reference to the work performed by the Sections of the Committee.

The Appraisals Committee is served by a full-time official of COU called the Executive Vice-Chairman of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. This official nominates to OCGS the three members of the Appraisals Committee (called "co-chairmen") who chair each of the three sections of the Committee. He allocates the workload of the Appraisals Committee among the three Sections and participates on a non-voting basis in all of their meetings. He manages all of the documentation that must come before the Appraisals Committee and conducts all of the correspondence which the Appraisals Committee directs to the universities and to its outside consultants.

The Appraisals Process distinguishes between what is called a "Standard Appraisal" and a "Periodic Appraisal". The latter term refers to the recurring appraisal of graduate programs by discipline or cognate area. The former refers in the main to the appraisal of new graduate programs but it can include existing graduate programs because individual universities and OCGS itself are free, for any reason, to submit a particular program for a Standard Appraisal if they wish to subject that program to an assessment outside the seven-year cycle at which periodic appraisals recur.

The distinction between a Standard and a Periodic Appraisal should not be overemphasized. Indeed, as we shall observe later in this Report, a key characteristic of the current Appraisals Process is that, unlike what prevailed before it was instituted in 1982, both forms of appraisal are conducted by the same Committee, thereby subjecting both new and old programs to an essentially common assessment of quality. For the balance of this Report, we shall refer to Standard as distinct from Periodic Appraisals only where a procedural difference arises that is material to the operation of the Appraisals Process.

In its operation the Appraisals Process comprises, graduate program by graduate program, the following steps:

1. A University Submission to the Appraisals Committee.
2. Review of the Submission by the Appraisals Committee.
3. Selection of outside consultants by the Appraisals Committee.
4. Review by the Appraisals Committee of the outside consultants' reports and of the university response thereto.
5. The Appraisals Committee determination of program quality.
6. Submission of the Appraisals Committee determination to OCGS and availability of an appeal procedure to the university.

How the Appraisals Process operates at Steps 1 through 5 has been crucial to the formulation of our opinion of its integrity and credibility and will therefore be probed in the next section of the Report. The existence of Step 6 is to be noted at this point because it is a truism that no process involving the application of human judgement, however credible or reliable, is infallible. The availability of an appeal procedure is therefore essential to the fairness of the Appraisals Process.

As constituted, the opportunity to appeal an Appraisals Committee determination is triggered at the point where OCGS receives the recommendation of this Committee concerning a particular graduate program. Debate at the OCGS meeting which receives this recommendation is open only to whether stipulated procedures were in fact followed. At or prior to the meeting at which the determination is received, the university whose program is affected may request what is called a Stage 1 appeal to the Executive Committee of OCGS. In a Stage 1 appeal, the OCGS executive, after considering statements from the university and from the Appraisals Committee, can disallow the appeal or refer the program back to the Appraisals Committee with instructions to correct identified defects in the procedures applied to the program. On completion of the Stage 1 appeal, a Stage 2 appeal becomes available.

A Stage 2 appeal involves an Appeal Board appointed on a case-by-case basis. Each Appeal Board is composed of three members of the Ontario professoriate, none of whom may be from the appellant university. One member of the Board is appointed by the executive head of the appellant university, one by the Chairman of OCGS and the third, who chairs the Board, by the Chairman of COU. The Appeal Board reviews a statement from the appellant university together with an Appraisals Committee response thereto, meets separately with representatives of the university and of the Appraisals Committee, and is empowered, after due consideration, to make a final dismissal of the appeal, or to return the program to the Appraisals Committee with instructions on the procedural flaws that are to be remedied, or to direct the Appraisals Committee to undertake an entirely new appraisal.

The importance which we attach to the appeal procedure we have described lies primarily in the fact that its availability confirms the existence of a needed safegard with respect to any instance in which the Appraisals Process might prove to be fallible. Beyond this, two observations can be made as a matter of fact. The first is that there has been no recourse to the appeal procedure since the Appraisals Process assumed its present form in 1982. The second is that the ultimate outcome of the appeal procedure, if it does not sustain the original determination of the Appraisals Committee, simply leads back to the same committee for an appraisal de novo. This is so by design, and flows from the explicit OCGS view that it:

> does not consider that the informed judgement of the Appraisals Committee should be subject to revision or reversal by another body, which cannot possess the broad historical perspective necessary to ensure standards of judgement comparable with those generally used by the Appraisals Committee and, hence, to ensure equitable treatment among the universities.[3]

We make these matter-of-fact observations because we take them as indicating that the Appraisals Process whose integrity and credibility we were asked to probe has the confidence of the body under whose aegis it operates.

---

[3] OCGS, "The Appeal of an Appraisal Recommendation", By-Law No. 2, p. 1.

II. THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE APPRAISALS PROCESS

Probing the Appraisals Process

We were asked to express an opinion on the integrity and credibility of the Appraisals Process in a setting where we disposed of approximately four months to undertake and complete our task. Accordingly, we were faced with the need to probe the Appraisals Process in a manner that was selective but also representative of the universe of the decisions that the Appraisals Committee is called upon to make. After preliminary discussions, held in December of 1985, with members of OCUA's Academic Advisory Committee and with the Executive Vice-Chairman and a representative of the Chairman of OCGS, we devised and then pursued the following means of probing the Appraisals Process.

1. We conducted personal interviews with the deans of nine Ontario graduate schools. In these interviews, we sought a decanal perspective on the value of the appraisals process to the graduate studies enterprise, an understanding of the decanal role vis-a-vis appraisals, and a checklist of any matters that might be considered as strengths or weaknesses of the Appraisals Process.

2. We personally attended, strictly as observers, all nine of the Appraisals Committee meetings that took place in January, February and March, 1986. This permitted us to witness each of the three Sections in which the Appraisals Committee operates three times. ... They exposed us to a broad range of the matters that can come before the Appraisals Committee including, on a repeated basis, all of the following:

a) Preliminary discussions by the Appraisals Committee of university submissions;

b) Decisions by the Appraisals Committee, where applicable, to forego the use of outside consultants;

c) Selection by the Appraisals Committee of outside consultants;

d) Review by the Appraisals Committee of outside consultants' reports and of the university responses thereto;

e) Preliminary discussions of program quality including recourse to additional information by way of university correspondence or visits with the Appraisals Committee;

f) Presentations to the Appraisals Committee made on behalf of individual graduate programs by university representatives who were scheduled to attend meetings either by invitation of the Committee or at the request of the university;

g) Final Committee determinations of quality in instances arising from both Standard Appraisals and Periodic Appraisals;

h) Appraisals Committee reviews of university reports that had been mandated by the Committee in instances where a graduate program, as a result of an earlier Periodic Appraisal, had been placed in Category "b".

For each meeting at which we were in attendance, we had available for our own reference all of the documentary evidence which the members of the Appraisals Committee had studied prior to the meeting attended.

3. We supplemented our personal attendance at three months of Appraisals Committee meetings with two additional probes designed to yield a longitudinal appreciation of the operation of the Appraisals Process. Having called for and received all of the relevant documentation, including university submissions, outside consultants' reports, university responses and pertinent Appraisals Committee minutes we reviewed:

a) the complete dossiers pertaining to all Periodic Appraisals in the discipline of Physics;

b) the complete dossiers pertaining to seven Standard Appraisals, chosen partly by design, partly at random. These appraisals involved the following new programs:

Ottawa: MA Spanish
Queen's: PhD Computing and Information Science
Toronto: MSL Studies in Law
Toronto: PhD Industrial Relations
Trent: MA Canadian Heritage and Development Studies
Waterloo: MMath Actuarial Science
Windsor: PhD Geology

4. We probed the Appraisals Process through other pertinent but less time-consuming tests. In this connection we examined the curriculum vitae of each Appraisals Committee member, reviewed appraisal results as they were reported by OCGS to OCUA for 1983-84 and 1984-85, and examined the results of Periodic Appraisals through December 31, 1985, tabulated both by discipline and by university. ...

Assessing the Appraisals Process

Because we were asked to express an opinion about the integrity and credibility of the Appraisals Process, we should first make our understanding of the nature of such an opinion clear to all concerned. Such an opinion, bearing as it does on a process that involves human judgement, is not an opinion about infallibility. Rather, it is an opinion concerning whether, in the course of the Appraisals Process, judgements are being assiduously made, on a case by case basis, in a manner that is at once informed, unbiased, balanced and consistent. In all instances, the judgements that we deem relevant to an opinion concerning the integrity and credibility of the Appraisals Process are those of the Appraisals Committee. In so far as the information or reports that come before the Appraisals Committee are insufficient, misleading or otherwise deficient, the formulation of an opinion concerning the Committee's judgements must take due account of the Committee's capacity to discern the relevant deficiencies and to seek the necessary remedies. An opinion could be positive or negative. If positive, it could be qualified or unqualified. To be unqualified an opinion should be based on findings that indicate no detectable lapse in the assiduousness with which judgements have been made.

Having delineated our understanding of what is involved, we testify that, in our unanimous and unqualified opinion, the Appraisals Process which is currently in place produces reliable and credible judgements of the academic quality of existing and proposed graduate programs in Ontario. The findings on which we base this opinion follow. They are arrayed under each of the five steps noted in our description of the operation of the Appraisals Process.

Step 1: The University Submission

This entry step to the Appraisals Process involves, whether for a Standard or Periodic Appraisal, the preparation by the university of a voluminous "appraisals brief" for the graduate program under review together with a list of nominations of outside consultants who, if selected by the Appraisals Committee, would be called upon to assess the graduate program on the basis of the appraisals brief and a visit to the university.

The Appraisals Brief

The burden of preparing the appraisals brief is borne primarily by the academic unit (department, centre, institute, whatever) responsible for the program. The brief responds to an OCGS checklist of information which is nothing if not comprehensive. This checklist directs that the fields of study, graduate student enrolment by field, sources and average level of student support, and projected enrolment for the next seven years be set out in detail. It calls for past and projected trends in the academic unit's undergraduate enrolment, and for a tabulation of the undergraduate and graduate teaching loads of faculty. Graduate courses, including joint undergraduate/graduate courses, are to be listed, together with the program's admission standards, residence requirements and evaluation procedures. The role of any collateral or supporting academic department is to be specified. The OCGS checklist calls for a description of faculty and student space and of the program's library resources, laboratory, equipment and computer facilities, including commitments for the next seven years. As well, it calls for a faculty profile including anticipated retirements over the next seven years. Finally, there must be a detailed curriculum vitae for each member of faculty. Although OCGS provides separate checklists for Standard and Periodic Appraisals, there is no material difference between them save that, in the case of new programs, there is necessarily less emphasis on retrospective information.

We find that the level of compliance with the OCGS checklists is generally satisfactory and often of a high order. Individual appraisals briefs, including supporting material, run to many hundreds of pages, and our probe sustains the contention, put to us by a number of graduate deans, that the preparation of an appraisals brief involves the academic unit concerned in a valuable self-examination which may in and of itself be conducive to the correction of weakness and the enhancement of strengths. There are some appraisals briefs that fail to comply fully with the checklists but we find that their number is sufficiently small to make them clearly stand out from an otherwise satisfactory norm.

The Outside Consultant Nominations

Our findings concerning this portion of the university submission are decidedly mixed. Our retrospective examination of the Periodic Appraisal for Physics indicated that the number and range of consultants nominated was generally satisfactory, as was the information supplied on most consultants. But the same was true of what we would characterize as only a bare majority of the nominations lists that were before the Appraisals Committee at the meetings we attended. In a significant number of instances, the number of consultants nominated might be below the minimum of ten specified by OCGS; the information on their credentials or qualifications might be perfunctory or seriously dated; there might be a lack of congruence between the specialties of the nominated consultants and the fields of study offered by the program; or all three. We frankly view the frequency with which these deficiencies appeared as inexcusable. With respect to our assessment of the Appraisals Process, they elevated Step 3, the selection of outside consultants by the Appraisals Committee, to the status of a major test of credibility.

Step 2: Review of the University Submission by the Appraisals Committee

This step involves a detailed review, which may stretch over several meetings, of the university submission by the Appraisals Committee. In the case of existing programs undergoing periodic appraisal, it may lead in certain instances to an Appraisals Committee decision to forego the use of outside consultants.

The Committee Review

The 21 members of the Appraisals Committee are distributed among its three sections so as to ensure that each Section is representative of the four main divisions of graduate study, namely the humanities, the social sciences, the physical sciences and the life sciences. This means that each section has a repository of expertise, if not directly in the discipline of whatever program is being appraised, at least in a cognate discipline. It is the practice of the Appraisals Committee to assign the lead role with respect to any given university submission to a single individual. This individual leads the initial discussion of the submission and continues to report on the program involved as it progresses through the various steps of the Appraisals Process. If the individual's term of office ends while the program is still engaged in the process, it will be assigned to the portfolio of another member.

Our attendance at Appraisals Committee meetings, whatever the Section, impressed upon us the thoroughness with which each committee member initiated the discussion of the university submission assigned to his or her portfolio. Significantly as well, we found that all members entered into the discussion in a manner which indicated that each was well acquainted with the content of the submission. Indeed, we found among the members an esprit de corps whose thrust is that each member can count on the informed assistance and criticism of all who comprise the relevant Committee Section.

The Committee's review of university submissions is abetted by what we have already noted is the generally satisfactory range of the information they contain. We find that the Committee is swift in identifying any information deficiencies and that it does not proceed with its review until these have been either remedied by the university or noted as matters that might be probed by the outside consultants. The Committee may discuss certain parts of a university submission on the basis of tabulations which the presenting member has either extracted from the submission or derived from its content, for example with respect to faculty publications and research grants.

Much of the Committee's review is directed to those parts of the university submission on which it will wish the expert opinion of outside consultants to focus. But the Committee is also realistic about what is to be expected of outside consultants. To offer a specific example from our attendance at Committee meetings, Committee concern over completion rates and the long average time to completion for Ph.D.'s in sociology led it to suggest possible study of this phenomenon by OCGS rather than direct it to the outside consultants whose own experience in the same discipline would likely be identical to that experienced in the programs under appraisal.

The Use of Outside Consultants

The Appraisals Process mandates the use of outside consultants in Standard Appraisals but vests a degree of discretion in the Appraisals Committee with respect to Periodic Appraisals. We find that the use of this discretion is structured within norms that appear to be well understood and reasonably applied by the Committee. In our observations, outside consultants will always be used when an existing program has not received the benefit of outside assessment under previous COU/OCGS appraisals/assessment regimes or when the individual university requests them. And they will almost invariably be used when an existing program has interdisciplinary or quasi-professional features. A particular concern that prompts the use of outside consultants in programs of this type is to ensure that the faculty members drawn from various discipline-based departments and identified with such programs are in fact prominently involved in the program's activities.

The discretion to forego the use of outside consultants has been confined to conventional programs in established disciplines. We find that it is applied sparingly, on a case by case basis, only to those programs whose faculty, curriculum and graduate student strength is abundantly apparent after the Appraisals Committee has completed its detailed review of the relevant university submission. In deciding to forego outside consultants, the Appraisals Committee simultaneously decides that the program is to be assigned to Category "a".

Our retrospective probe of the Periodic Appraisal in Physics satisfies us that the evidence before the Appraisals Committee supported its choice, where made, to forego consultants. We make a similar finding with respect to those instances in which the Committee made this choice during meetings at which we were in attendance. In the result, to forego consultants permits economies in time and cost. Given the care with which the discretion to forego is applied, we consider that the resulting economies contribute to the cost-effectiveness of the Appraisals Process.

Step 3: Selection of Outside Consultants by the Appraisals Committee

Given what we have deemed to be the inexcusably frequent appearance of seriously flawed consultant nominations, the actual selection of outside consultants by the Appraisals Committee became a particularly severe test of its credibility. We find that the Appraisals Committee consistently passes this test with flying colours. At every point observed, the Appraisals Committee demonstrated that its selection of outside consultants is fully sensitive to: (1) ensuring that the consultants, be they academics, industrialists or public servants, are individuals of demonstrated scholarly or scientific achievement; (2) ensuring that the expertise of the consultants matches the special fields that comprise the graduate programs being appraised; (3) avoiding consultants who might have unduly close ties with the faculty who staff the program; (4) avoiding consultants who might have a disciplinary or other bias against a valid program orientation, for example a particular methodology or a particular empirical orientation.

Even in the instances where the university's nominations are well documented, the Appraisals Committee will request that the university supply additional names if this is necessary to ensure that the above desiderata are met. Alternatively, the Committee may itself suggest consultant names to the university concerned. As for the instances in which consultant nominations are flawed, the Committee will simply refuse to proceed until the university has supplied adequate information.

As a general rule, the Committee proceeds to invite two outside consultants in the case of master's programs and three consultants for doctoral programs. But the Committee does not hesitate to add to these numbers if it considers that the special fields which comprise a graduate program call for a range of expertise that no two or three consultants could possess. Whatever the number of consultants used for any particular program, no more than one may hold a faculty appointment in an Ontario university.

The diligence with which the Appraisals Committee pursues the selection of outside consultants continues until its invitations have been accepted. So as to economize on the time consumed by this stage of the process, it is the practice of the Committee to designate alternative choices so that these may be invited in the event of refusals. The relatively high incidence of refusals, occasioned by the time commitments of the prestigeous individuals invited, may exhaust the Committee's alternate selections; in all such instances, the Committee will seek additional nominations from the university concerned and ensure that its information on the nominees is adequate before it issues further invitations.

Step 4: Review by the Appraisals Committee of the Outside Consultants' Reports and of the University Response thereto

Outside consultants prepare individual reports on the programs they have agreed to appraise. They are equipped with clearly written terms of reference which currently run to six typewritten pages and are officially approved by OCGS. The consultants prepare their reports on the basis of the university submission and a site visit. When the reports are received by the Appraisals office, they are not given to the Committee but instead are sent to the university for a response. The written university response may be in two parts, one from the academic unit whose program was appraised, the other from the graduate dean (or equivalent officer) of the university concerned. The Committee reviews the consultants' reports and the university response jointly.

Carefully though consultants have been selected, the quality and utility of their reports vary. In our observations, the fact that the consultants have worked separately provides the Appraisals Committee with individual reports that are a useful check on one another. In turn, the university response provides the Committee with an additional checkpoint that becomes particularly valuable when the quality of consultants' reports varies or when the views expressed in the consultants' reports differ. In its consideration of the reports and the response, the Committee's deliberations are greatly assisted by the diligence with which, at Step 2 of the Appraisals Process, the Committee reviewed the university submission.

We find that the care with which the Committee deliberates at this juncture in its proceedings is assiduous. Only if the quality of the program is beyond reasonable doubt will the Committee proceed directly to assign the program to Category "a" in the case of a Periodic Appraisal or to approve the program in the case of a Standard Appraisal. The Committee may request additional information from the university or request a meeting with the university before proceeding to a determination. If the Committee is proceeding to a recommendation other than Category "a" or approval, it will notify the university of the nature of its determination on a provisional basis so that the institution may avail itself of the opportunity to meet with the Committee. In our observations, this opportunity is normally seized. The three university visits which we witnessed in the course of our attendance at Committee meetings were revealing as to the state of the university's preparation, which varied. As for the questions posed by Committee members to the university representatives we find that they can be described, in a word, as tough.

Step 5: The Appraisals Committee Determination of Program Quality

Standard Appraisals

The key determination with respect to new programs undergoing Standard Appraisal is whether the Committee recommendspositively or negatively. A positive recommendation is essentially unqualified although the Committee may accompany its recommendation with a request for a report whose content will provide an opportunity to monitor the early development of the program. The quality of the program is not at issue; typically what is called for in a report are the initial trends in enrolment, student funding and research support. What is therefore critical to a determination of program quality in a Standard Appraisal is what transpired at Step 4 of the Appraisals Process.

Even more than our attendance at Committee meetings, our retrospective probe of seven Standard Appraisals proved central to the formulation of our findings on the determination of quality with respect to new programs. This retrospective probe, by exposing the longitudinal dimension of Standard Appraisals, makes it clear that the pace at which Step 4 proceeds is particularly careful and deliberate. The Committee must be satisfied that any weaknesses identified in the university submission, either by the outside consultants or in the course of Committee deliberations, have been remedied. It must be satisfied that all relevant resource commitments have been made. It must be satisfied with respect to any other matters that may have occasioned doubt including, notably, student evaluation procedures.

For a Standard Appraisal to take two to three years is a common occurrence. Two of the Standard Appraisals we reviewed spanned a period of five years. One of these resulted in a negative determination; the other resulted in a positive determination which subsequently led to program funding after OCUA's other criteria were met. The Appraisals Committee's consistent insistence that any of its doubts be removed generated repeated meetings with university representatives and repeated calls for university assurances. In the circumstances, we find that a positive determination of program quality in the case of a Standard Appraisal is equivalent to a Category "a" determination in the case of a Periodic Appraisal. The importance we attach to this finding is that it supports the claim, made at the time the current Appraisals Process was instituted, that this Process would generate a common standard of quality for both new and existing programs.

Given the length of time that Standard Appraisals consume, we offer another finding. It is common for a new program to remain on the Appraisals Committee's docket for a period that exceeds its members' term of office. This appears to have no material effect on the continuity of the Committee's deliberations. In particular, the member who inherits the role of leading Committee discussions of the program exhibits a well developed understanding of its past progress.

Periodic Appraisals

Here the Appraisals Committee's determination of quality must be made with reference to the four Categories defined earlier in this Report. On the basis of the findings we have made above, we can pronounce ourselves satisfied that the graduate programs assigned to Category "a" do indeed meet a comparable standard of good quality such that they can all be said to have the following characteristics.

(1) The members of faculty regularly qualify for the peer-adjudicated grants of the relevant national research-granting agency, i.e. the Medical Research Council, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Their work is published in recognized scholarly journals and in books which are reviewed in such journals. They have not only a lifetime publication record but one that indicates continued output in recent years.

(2) The relevant library, laboratory or computing facilities and resources are all reasonably adequate and up-to-date, and are backed by institutional commitments which give reasonable assurance that they will remain in this state for the next seven years.

(3) The program curriculum is comparable in scope and difficulty to the curricula offered by similar programs in Canada and other countries.

(4) The program's students all meet a minimum entrance requirement, which almost invariably must be B or Second Class Honours standing from whatever undergraduate institution they may have attended. The students are subject to universally recognized evaluation procedures appropriate to the degree level (master's or doctoral) involved. They have reasonable access to sources of financial support, and enjoy a satisfactory rate of success in qualifying for national or province-wide scholarships and fellowships. After graduation, they regularly qualify for positions that demand the level of training they received.

We find that Category "b" is at once interesting and challenging. In the key words already quoted in this Report, programs in Category "b" are:

> Programs that have achieved a level of good quality at the time of appraisal, but for which it was expected that problems would develop before the next seven-year review, for example, due to retirements of senior faculty.

An intrinsically good program at the time of a periodic appraisal might indeed yield discernible signs of pending trouble, and the most readily identifiable of these signs would be precisely the one that the above text cites as its sole example.

What makes Category "b" interesting and challenging is the environment of financial restraint in which all Ontario universities find themselves. Within any given university, this environment understandably invites strategic behaviour by every academic unit. Departments, centres and institutes are necessarily engaged in a competitive struggle to maintain their faculty complements in the face of base-budget reductions. In this setting, no greater prize might be perceived than an appraisal outcome which places an academic unit's program in Category "b". This outcome enables the unit to force the university's central administration either to grant a faculty replacement position or to face the reassignment of the program to Category "d" and the withdrawal of public funding that inevitably follows.

We were not surprised to find confirmation of what we have just sketched in our interviews with graduate deans, and in the extent to which appraisal briefs emphasize problems anticipated from pending retirements. At this point, however, we have found telling evidence of the credibility of the Appraisals Process in the manner in which the Appraisals Committee approaches the assignment of a graduate program to Category "b". Doubtless reflecting the fact that the Committee's members, as experienced academics, are familiar with the strategic behaviour occasioned by fiscal austerity, the Committee deliberations we have observed indicate that the mere fact of pending retirements does not give rise to concern about program quality. The Committee searches for evidence that the senior faculty whose retirement is pending have indeed remained productive in recent years. As well, the Committee is very conscious of the distribution of senior faculty among the special fields that comprise a graduate program. Pending retirements in a field that is stocked with adequate faculty numbers will not occasion a Category "b" determination. We find, in sum, that a program is assigned to Category "b" by reason of pending retirements only if these indeed place its quality in jeopardy.

When a program is placed in Category "b" for reasons other than pending retirements, we observe that this is normally because the Committee has called for changes in degree requirements or evaluation procedures and wishes to monitor them. We take this as indicating that the Appraisals Process has a salutary effect on academic standards.

A Category "c" determination, in our observation, follows from Committee concerns which, though relatively minor, are registered by important indicators. Examples include a low volume of recent faculty publications, low or deteriorating research grant levels, equipment deficiencies or deteriorating library resources. Category "c", like Category "b", requires the university to submit a report within a period that is normally from two to four years.

From our observation of Committee discussion of programs in Categories "b" and "c", it is clear that the Committee uses these as temporary categories. When the Committee decided to recommend the reclassification of a Category "b" program to Category "a", we found that the evidence before the Committee was held to the test of being beyond reasonable doubt. Our observations did not yield a program that was reassigned to Category "d", but they yielded instances in which further information is being demanded.

We offer no specific comment on the direct assignment of programs to Category "d". This is because we have only one observation point that may or may not yield this determination in the near future. We consider that this observation point remains sub judice.

In closing this part of our Report, we wish to enunciate a finding that cuts across all the steps of the Appraisals Process. The three Sections of the Appraisals Committee achieve a consistency in the quality and care of their deliberations and judgements that is nothing short of remarkable. This is doubtless due in large measure not only to the scholarly competence of the Committee members but to the depth of their experience in the scholarly enterprise. And it is due as well to the pivotal role played by the Executive Vice-Chairman of OCGS as the resourceful, knowledgeable indeed magisterial presence that is common to all three Sections in which the Appraisals Committee operates. The findings which we have made in this Report are a tribute to the members of the Appraisals Committee and above all to the Executive Vice-Chairman, Dr. Lynn Watt who has held office since the current Appraisals Process was in its early stages.

III. OBSERVATIONS

Having found that the Appraisals Process currently in place produces reliable and credible judgements of academic quality, we offer the following observations in the spirit that all concerned - - the universities, OCGS, COU, OCUA, the Government of Ontario - - are currently blessed with a good thing which above all should be nurtured and maintained. Some of our observations are self-evidently directed more to certain participants in the over-arching process of graduate program planning and funding than to others, but we consider that all concerned have a stake in promoting a constructive and collaborative state of affairs.

1. Longitudinal stability is of critical importance to the effectiveness of the Appraisals Process. We ourselves have no changes to recommend as a result of the task we have undertaken. In particular we find that the Committee procedures are satisfactory and that the Periodic Appraisal categories, including the practice whereby programs may remain in Categories "b" and "c" only temporarily, are appropriate. Over time, it may well be that needs for change will materialize. Respect for the stability of the Appraisals Process dictates that the burden of proof should always lie squarely on the proponents of change.

2. The Executive Vice-Chairman of OCGS is pivotal to the operation of the Appraisals Process. The population from which suitable appointees can be drawn for this position is very small indeed. The position places a premium on thoroughgoing familiarity with graduate studies in Ontario. Experience at the decanal level is a virtual prerequisite for appointment. We consider it most fortunate that Dr. Watt's announced successor, Dr. Maurice Yeates of Queen's University, possesses the background which the position demands. As successive appointments are made over time, we consider that COU is well advised always to consider the Executive Vice-Chairman of OCGS as the single most important appointment it makes.

3. The role played by each member of the Appraisals Committee is enormously demanding. The task is of course challenging but it is also voraciously time-consuming and often tedious. There is a dual qualification for membership: scholarly status and familiarity with the scholarly enterprise. Graduate deans have observed to us

that the recruitment of Committee members is not an easy task. Difficult though this recruitment task may be, our observation of the Appraisals Committee satisfies us that it has so far been executed with great success. In the normal run of human organizations, there is a tide in the appointment of committees that all too often ebbs after a committee has existed for half-a-dozen or more years. This must not be allowed to occur in the case of the Appraisals Committee. Individual graduate deans, and for that matter executive heads, have a particular responsibility to pursue whatever means are appropriate to ensure that the quality of the Appraisals Committee is maintained.

4. Graduate deans should take stock, both individually and collectively, of what they can do to ease the burden that the Appraisals Process places on the Appraisals Committee. The deans we interviewed are unanimous in their support for the Appraisals Process. In this light the incidence of recurring inadequacies in the lists nominating outside consultants is indeed inexcusable, not least because, in our observations, no single university has a consistent record of adequacy on this score. There are other inadequacies which may be more peculiar to certain institutions than others. Those involved know who they are, not least because the Executive Vice-Chairman has the unenviable task of bringing shortcomings to the attention of all concerned. We wish to single out the importance of the OCGS stipulation that the university response to outside consultants reports should be comprised of a decanal response as well as a response from the academic unit whose program is under appraisal. A covering letter on graduate school stationery attached to the academic unit's response does not constitute a decanal response.

5. In the course of the Appraisals Committee deliberations which we observed, various Committee members declared that certain programs are particularly perplexing. These are master's programs whose orientation can perhaps best be described as professional or quasi-professional and whose graduates are equipped with a credential that is often recognized by such classes of employers as hospitals, mental health centres, public service commissions and the like. When such a program is clearly labelled as such, for example Master of Education, the thrust of the program is clearly apparent to the Committee. But how is a Master of Science in Nursing, or a Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology to be approached? As an M.A. or M.Sc. in the

discipline involved, with consequent research requirements for both faculty and students? Or as an M.N. or M.Psych.? We consider that OCGS would be well advised to consider such questions with a view to providing some guidance or possible changes in degree appellations. It may be that OCUA, perhaps through its Academic Advisory Committee, should also assess the questions.

6. When we studied the outcome of Appraisals Committee determinations, we discerned a pattern, which is peculiar to the humanities, that begs for serious study by all who are concerned with the graduate enterprise in Ontario. There currently exists in certain disciplines a cluster of programs that have been assigned to Category "b" because their quality is jeopardized by pending faculty retirements. Three Ph.D. programs in Classics -- those offered by McMaster, Ottawa and Toronto - - are currently in this Category. So are three programs in German - - those offered by Queen's, Toronto and Waterloo. It is generally true, not only in Ontario but in other jurisdictions, that established graduate programs in many humanistic disciplines are endangered by what has been a long-term erosion in the undergraduate enrolment needed to provide an adequate financial base for the resources that are required. Given continued fiscal austerity, coupled with no forseeable shift in undergraduate enrolment trends, the future of serious scholarship in some very important disciplines may be at stake. This prompted us to suggest, in our interviews with graduate deans, that it would be most salutary if there were mechanisms, perhaps only informal ones, which ensured inter-university consultation in a setting where, because Category "b" is a temporary category, individual institutions must face - - very soon - - the issue of making the investment required to restore humanities programs to Category "a" or permitting them to drop to Category "d" and in effect to extinction. Because the sum of such individual decisions could mean that Ontario is altogether without graduate programs in a major discipline, we suggest that the matter is well worth the attention of OCUA itself.

Conclusion

Those who accept, as we did, an engagement to pronounce an opinion on the integrity and credibility of a process that has not only academic consequences but an impact on the distribution of public monies should be prepared to face the question of their own credibility. We are entirely content to leave the judgement of our credibility to the readers of this Report and we consider that they are entitled to know the standard of care pursuant to which we formulated our opinion on the integrity and credibility of the Appraisals Process. We have covenanted together, and hereby testify, that our standard of care is the standard to which each of us would consider himself bound were his opinion subject to examination and cross-examination under oath.

J. Stefan Dupré (Chairman)
George A. Harrower
Marc-Adélard Tremblay

April 11, 1986

86-IV MINISTERIAL CONSENTS PURSUANT TO THE DEGREE GRANTING ACT, 1983

Introduction

In this Memorandum, Council continues the practice, established in Advisory Memorandum 86-I, of advising on the granting of Ministerial consents pursuant to the Degree Granting Act, Chapter 36, Statutes of Ontario, 1983. This Memorandum, in concert with Advisory Memorandum 86-I, concludes Council's consideration of applications for the renewal of existing consents, evaluated in accordance with the Ministry's policy statement of November 1985 re: The Granting of Ministerial Consents as authorized by the Degree Granting Act.

Council offers advice with respect to five institutions whose consents expire on August 31, 1986, and whose applications for renewal have been submitted.

Renewals of Existing Consents

The Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago

The Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago, Illinois was granted a Ministerial consent in October 1984, to offer the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology program in co-operation with the Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario until August 31, 1986. The Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario, established in 1968, is a non-profit educational organization and a member of the North American Society of Adlerian Psychology.

Council's assessment of the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago's application for the renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

The Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology is included in the accreditation which the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago has been granted. Council notes that the Institute's accreditation status was reaffirmed in 1983-84 following a comprehensive review and is valid for five years. The next comprehensive review of the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago is scheduled for 1988-89.

The Ministerial consent which was issued to the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago in 1984 was granted on the condition that the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools certify, on the basis of a site visit, that:

> the degree program offered in Ontario meets the same standards that apply to the program as offered in the United States with respect to admission requirements, curricula, qualifications of faculty, hours of instruction, access to library and laboratory facilities and requirements for graduation.[1]

A site-visit and evaluation of the Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario was conducted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in May 1984 and a report was later submitted to the Ministry certifying that the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology degree program offered in Ontario met the same standards which are applied to the program offered at the Alfred Adler Institute home campus in Chicago, Illinois.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements specified in the Ministry's policy statement for degree granting institutions established in the United States have been met by the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology offered by the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago is a professional program which neither prepares students for registration as psychologists in the State of Illinois or other states requiring a masters or doctorate degree, nor qualifies students as private practitioners in counselling or psychotherapy. The Alfred Adler

---

[1] Letter from Ms. Karen Kerr, University Affairs Officer to Mr. Thurston E. Manning, Director, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, June 18, 1984.

Institute "discourages persons at this level of education from engaging in unsupervised private practice."[2]

The Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago provides professional training in the principles and methods of Individual Psychology - the system of psychological theory and practice originated by Alfred Adler. The purpose of this program is to provide an opportunity, to those persons already employed in the human service field, for clinical training and education in the philosophy and application of the theory and techniques of Adlerian psychology:

> for the benefit it can bring to the helping professions and to the public at large in dealing with human behavior and psychological disorder.[3]

The Alfred Adler Institute is the only accredited independent specialized graduate degree-granting Adlerian training institute in the world.

The courses in Ontario are offered on the weekend making the program available to fully employed professionals. Guidance counsellors, teachers, doctors, clergy, social workers, counsellors and therapists most frequently enrol in the program. Through clinical and classroom training, the program prepares its students to apply their knowledge in public and private sector agencies, community mental health centers, hospitals, correctional institutions, youth agencies, schools, family counselling centers, business and industry. Students most often apply their knowledge to their current employment where counselling skills are used to prevent or resolve human problems related to personal and personnel issues, including family problems, depression, anxiety, school adjustment, marital distress, grief and loss.

The Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario is one of many institutions offering courses which, upon individual review, have been recognized by the College of Family Physicians of Canada as courses applicable to family medicine. Members of the College who enrol in approved courses offered by the Alfred Adler Institute will receive credit toward the 50 hours per year of continuing medical education required for College membership. The Qualifications Evaluation Council of Ontario and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation recognize courses offered by the Alfred Adler Institute for the purpose of professional upgrading and increases in the level of remuneration.

---

[2] Alfred Adler Institute, Application for Renewal of Ministerial Consent, March 13, 1986, p. 6.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

The Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario has an average of 90 students enrolled each year, however new enrolments appear to fluctuate. There were 36 new enrolments in 1983-84, 20 in 1984-85 and 38 in 1985-86. The Alfred Adler Institute forecasts that there will be 45 to 50 new enrolments in 1986-87 with a subsequent annual increase in enrolment of 10% to 1990-91.

Since 1982-83 there has been a total of twelve graduates of the Ontario program with six students expected to graduate in the fall of 1986.[4]

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

Courses for the Alfred Adler Institute, Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology program are offered in Toronto at 252 Bloor Street West. All audio visual equipment utilized is provided by the Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario and is kept at its administrative office in Willowdale, Ontario.

Throughout the program, the resources of the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago library and the Illinois state interlibrary loan system are available to Ontario students by mail. Students are responsible for postage expenses. In Ontario, students have access to a small library at the Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario which contains 500 volumes for borrowing, consisting primarily of books required for course work, with a limited selection of other books.[5]

---

[4] Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario, Response to Request for Additional Information, June 12, 1986, p. 1.

Also in Ontario, students enrolled in the Master of Arts, Counselling Psychology program at the Alfred Adler Institute of Ontario receive a library card and full borrowing privileges from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE).

Council is satisfied that the Ontario on-site facility and library services of the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago are adequate.

Recommendation

Council has reviewed the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology in Toronto and is satisfied that the relevant criteria have been met.

Council recommends that the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago be granted a renewal of its consent for a three year period ending June 30, 1989.

Council notes that the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago is scheduled to undergo a comprehensive review in 1988-89. Council suggests that a site-visit to the Ontario location be undertaken in conjunction with this comprehensive review to determine whether the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology program offered in Ontario continues to meet the same standards which are applied to the program at the home campus.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-12

MASTER OF ARTS IN COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY AT THE ALFRED ADLER INSTITUTE OF CHICAGO

THAT, the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago be granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology in Toronto, Ontario for a period of three years from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1989.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 4

Central Michigan University

Central Michigan University of Mount Pleasant, Michigan was granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Master of Arts in Education, concentration in Community College Education, at Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology for a two year period up to August 31, 1986. Central Michigan University has applied for a renewal of this consent to continue offering the Master of Arts in Education program at the campus of Humber College for one year and to begin offering the program at Durham College of Applied Arts and Technology for one cycle of the program, or approximately thirty months.

Council's assessment of Central Michigan University's application for the renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

Central Michigan University is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The last comprehensive review of the institution took place in 1978-1979. A focused review is currently underway, and the report should be available this fall.

Education programs at Central Michigan University are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The most recent NCATE assessment of Central Michigan's home campus education programs occurred in 1981, with the next evaluation scheduled for 1990. In June 1984, NCA conducted site visits at the three Ontario centres where the Central Michigan University program was being offered. The report and subsequent correspondence certified that the program offered in Ontario met the same standards as are applied to the program being offered at the home campus.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements specified in the Ministry's policy statement for degree granting institutions established in the United States have been met by Central Michigan University.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Master of Arts in Education, concentration in Community College Education program offers an opportunity for the professional development of community college faculty in Ontario. The program consists of ten courses offered in Ontario on weekends over a 30 month period. The only prerequisite to the master's degree program is a baccalaureate degree. The programs offered at Humber and Durham Colleges would be identical.

Out-of-state programs offered by Central Michigan University are initiated at the request of a corporation, association, government agency or other organization. The program offered by Central Michigan University purports to create an "opportunity for working adults who, because of career, personal or geographic circumstances have limited access to more traditional forms of higher education".[6]

As indicated by the president of Humber College, this program is significant to the professional development of community college faculty:

> Since the majority of our faculty come from industry, the need for academic currency in various specializations is most important, as well as a knowledge of the college system, for them to be effective.[7]

Both Humber and Durham have placed a high priority on staff development and have indicated that their faculty are fulfilling professional development needs by pursuing this master's degree.[8] The program is made available primarily to the faculty of the host college however, when space permits, faculty from other Ontario community colleges have been admitted to the program.

In the original consent granted to Central Michigan University to offer its Master of Arts in Education program in October 1984, the Minister indicated that as

---

6. Site-Visit Report, p. 9.

7. Letter from Dr. R.A. Gordon, President, Humber College, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, July 7, 1986, p. 1.

8. Letter from Mr. Melvin L. Garland, President, Durham College of Applied Arts and Technology, to Dr. Ralph Benson, Assistant Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities, September 6, 1985 and telephone conversation with Dr. R.A. Gordon, President, Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology, July 2, 1986.

a condition of the consent:

> Humber College and Central Michigan University should continue in their efforts to involve an Ontario institution in this program with the goal of such institution eventually taking over the program.

Both Humber and Durham Colleges have made enquiries in this regard but have found that Ontario institutions are, for various reasons, unable to take over the provision of the program.[9]

Since 1984 the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) has been offering at Humber College its part-time Master of Education (MEd) in Higher Education and Master of Arts (MA) in Higher Education programs which pertain to community college education for the purpose of providing professional development for college faculty. The OISE program has approximately 15 students enrolled in the MEd program and two in the MA program offered at Humber.

Although the programs offered by OISE and Central Michigan University cover similar course material, OISE indicated they viewed the programs as complementary rather than competitive. Students in the Central Michigan program often take courses offered by the OISE program, which are accepted as transfer credits toward their Central Michigan degree. Many students in the Central Michigan University program would not be eligible for admission to the OISE program since their backgrounds are often professional or because they are unable to meet University of Toronto admission standards for other reasons. OISE has also indicated that, under current staffing and resource limitations, they would be unable to accommodate the number of students in the Central Michigan program in their program offered at Humber, nor could they offer their program this

---

[9] Letter from Dr. R.A. Gordon, President, Humber College, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, July 7, 1986 and Letter from Mr. D. Michie, Dean, Applied Arts and Health Sciences, Durham College, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, July 4, 1986.

September at the Durham College campus.[10]

Student demand for the program offered by Central Michigan University averages 32 students per course. As of March 1986 there were 77 students enrolled in the program at Humber, 22 of whom graduated in May 1986. A total of 55 students will continue to be enrolled. While there will be no new enrolments in the program in 1986-87, demand from those currently enrolled is projected to continue for one more year, at which time Central Michigan University has indicated that it intends to close the program at Humber.

Projected enrolment in the program at Durham College is 30 students for one cycle of the program.

It is clear that the program offered by Central Michigan University focuses on issues concerning the delivery of community college education and is tailored to the particular needs of full-time community college faculty who seek professional advancement and enhancement of their skills. Council notes that this program meets a need which can not be met by an Ontario institution at this time.

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

The Master of Arts in Education, concentration in Community College Education program is offered at the campus of Humber College. Humber College provides the classroom space, office space and equipment necessary to support the program. Facilities and equipment required to offer the program in Oshawa would be provided by Durham College.

Resources of the Central Michigan University library are available to all off-campus students in Ontario. Students in Ontario have collect-call privileges to the home campus library which can be used to order books, photocopies of journals and to receive literature and reference assistance at no cost to the student. In addition, a Central Michigan University librarian, specifically assigned to serve the Ontario off-campus group, visits Ontario students a minimum of once per year to explain the off-campus library services, provide library orientation and give bibliographic instruction. Students in Ontario also have access to the library of the college at which they are employed.

---

[10] Telephone conversation with Dr. Michael Skolnick, Co-ordinator of Community College Programs, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, July 4, 1986.

Council is satisfied the Ontario on-site facility and library services of Central Michigan University are adequate.

Recommendation

Council has reviewed Central Michigan University's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Master of Arts in Education, concentration in Community College Education program at Humber College in Rexdale and Durham College in Oshawa.

Due to the nature of the student demand for this program Council believes that the renewal of Central Michigan University's consent should be granted for one year at the Humber College site and for three years at the Durham College location.

Since the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools will have completed a focused review of Central Michigan University by the fall of 1986, Council suggests that these consents be conditional upon Central Michigan University maintaining its accreditation in the United States. Further, it should be the responsibility of the Ministry to ensure that this condition is met.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-13 **MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION CONCENTRATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION AT CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

THAT, Central Michigan University be granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Master of Arts in Education, concentration in Community College Education at Humber College in Rexdale, Ontario for a period of one

> **year from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, and at Durham College in Oshawa, Ontario for three years from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1989, both consents granted on the condition that Central Michigan University maintain its accreditation status in the United States.**

Northern Illinois University

Northern Illinois University of Dekalb, Illinois was granted a Ministerial consent in October 1984 to offer the Master of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Education at the Forest Valley Outdoor Education Centre, North York, Ontario until August 31, 1986.

Council's assessment of Northern Illinois University's application for the renewal of its Ministerial consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

Northern Illinois University is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Education programs at Northern Illinois University are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). An NCATE site-visit to the Ontario location at which the program was offered was conducted on August 2-3, 1984 and on December 1-2, 1984. In the opinion of the NCATE consultant, the courses offered by Northern Illinois University at the Forest Valley Outdoor Education Centre were comparable to those offered at the home campus and NCATE standards were being met.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements specified in the Ministry's policy statement for degree granting institutions established in the United States have been met by Northern Illinois University.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Master of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Teacher Education program offered by Northern Illinois University is not a program leading to certification as an elementary or secondary school teacher. This program is offered in co-operation with, and at the initial request of, the Council of Outdoor Educators in Ontario (COEO), who contract this program from Northern Illinois University, as a professional development opportunity for full-time outdoor educators, elementary and secondary classroom teachers, employees of conservation authorities, community service employees and other COEO members. Most often students enrol in individual courses as a Student-at-Large for the purpose of professional growth. As a Student-at-Large, students can apply credit for five courses toward a graduate degree if they choose to enrol as a program major and are accepted by the Northern Illinois University Graduate School. Few students (five percent or less)[11] intend to achieve the degree available, and few submit these credits toward degree programs at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), York or Brock Universities.

Northern Illinois University has offered two courses per year in Toronto since 1977-78 with an average of 20-23 students enrolled per course. Courses offered in the fall term 1985 and spring term 1986 attracted 17 and 19 students respectively.

The program offers a variety of courses related to outdoor educational philosophy, teaching methods, outdoor interpretation and arts and crafts. Degree requirements stipulate that students must complete 21 credit hours in Outdoor Education courses and 9 credit hours in a cognate field, with two courses taken at the home campus in Illinois. Courses are delivered over four weekends.

COEO requested that Northern Illinois offer graduate courses for fully employed individuals to take on a part-time basis in order to upgrade their knowledge and leadership skills in matters pertaining to outdoor education. Proponents of the Ontario outdoor education movement indicate that:

> The Northern Illinois University Master Degree program has been a truly significant impact upon the Ontario scene... We are in no danger of losing our unique identity by endorsing the Northern

---

[11] Northern Illinois University, Application for Renewal of Ministerial Consent, March 18, 1986, p. 1.

> Illinois University program as a COEO professional development program. On the contrary, I see it as a timely event which has aided both those who have taken the program and the movement in general by assuring the critics that there is an important role for Outdoor Educators in both the formal and non-formal education of Ontario's youth.[12]

Outdoor education courses offered by Northern Illinois University are recognized by the Qualifications Evaluation Council of Ontario and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation as professional development programs and may entitle elementary and secondary school teachers to increased levels of remuneration.

A condition attached to the original consent granted to Northern Illinois University stated that:

> Northern Illinois University and the Outdoor Educators of Ontario must attempt to involve an Ontario institution in the delivery of this program, with the goal of such institution eventually taking over the program.[13]

Since receiving their original ministerial consent, COEO and Northern Illinois have contacted OISE and Brock concerning the possibility of these institutions offering the Outdoor Education program. Although no progress was made in discussions with OISE, a series of discussions was held with representatives of Brock University. Ultimately these discussions revealed that the offerings at Brock could not fulfill the needs of COEO members at this time.

Brock currently offers four part-time courses in Outdoor Environmental Studies which are considered an alternative to, rather than a duplication of, the

---

12. Mr. Chuck Hopkins, School Superintendent, Toronto Board of Education, One Perspective on the Impact of the Northern Illinois Masters Degree Program on Ontario Education by an Ontario Outdoor Educator, provided by Northern Illinois University, March 18, 1986.

13. Letter from Dr. Bette Stephenson, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to Dr. Orville E. Jones, Assistant Dean, International and Special Programs, Northern Illinois University, October 15, 1984, p. 2.

courses offered by Northern Illinois University.[14] Brock's courses in the area of Outdoor Environmental Education, offered only during the summer months, are part of the curriculum specialization within the Master of Education program. These courses are only available at Brock's Sheridan College off-campus location in Oakville.

Council notes that, in addition to the limited number of courses available at Brock, the two half credit courses in Outdoor Environmental Education offered in the summer term 1986 are at capacity with 32 students enrolled. A waiting list has been established for courses which will be offered during the summer term 1987.[15] Officials at Brock University have indicated that they do not offer an entire program in Outdoor Environmental Education nor do they have plans to develop a specialization in this field of study.[16]

Council recognizes that, although Northern Illinois and COEO have investigated the possibility of having the Northern Illinois Master of Science in Education program replaced or partially replaced by an Ontario institution, an alternative to the program is not presently available.

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

All facilities and equipment required to offer the Master of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Teacher Education program are leased by the Council of Outdoor Educators in Ontario, Professional Development Committee, from Toronto area school boards.

In Ontario, students have access to the resources of the Forest Valley Outdoor Education Library, the F.W.

---

[14] Telephone Conversation with Dr. James Gram, Associate Professor, Graduate and Undergraduate Department, College of Education, Brock University, June 16, 1986.

[15] Ibid., June 16, 1986.

[16] Ibid., June 16, 1986.

Minkler Professional Library of the North York Board of Education and all other facilities of the North York Board of Education. Over fifty doctoral dissertations in the field of outdoor education, which have been purchased by COEO, are available at the Minkler Library to Ontario students enrolled in the Northern Illinois program.

In addition to the library services available in Ontario, Northern Illinois University faculty can issue main campus library cards and bring a lending library to class for student use.

Council is satisfied that the Ontario on-site facilities and library services of Northern Illinois University are adequate.

Recommendation

Council has reviewed Northern Illinois University's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Master of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Education program.

Northern Illinois University's original Ministerial consent stipulated that attempts must be made to involve an Ontario institution either in the delivery of courses or the provision of the program. This condition appears unachievable in the near future. Council recognizes that consultation between Northern Illinois/COEO representatives and Ontario institutions has occurred, however, it appears that no Ontario institution will participate in, or replace, the Master of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Education program at this time, or in the near future. In light of the student demand for courses specifically pertaining to outdoor education, Council believes that the renewal of the Northern Illinois University's consent should cover a three year period to June 30, 1989.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-14 **MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION SPECIALIZING IN OUTDOOR EDUCATION AT NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY**

THAT, Northern Illinois University be granted a consent to offer its Master

of Science in Education specializing in Outdoor Education in Toronto, Ontario for a period of three years from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1989.

University of Bridgeport

The University of Bridgeport, Connecticut, was granted a Ministerial consent in October 1984 to offer its Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program in Toronto until August 31, 1986.

Council's assessment of the University of Bridgeport's application for the renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

The University of Bridgeport is accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). NEASC accreditation is granted for a ten year period with a focused review occurring after five years. The last NEASC comprehensive institutional evaluation of the University of Bridgeport occurred in 1979, followed by a focused review in 1985 after which the university was reaccredited for a five year period. The next NEASC comprehensive evaluation is scheduled for Fall 1989.

An NEASC site visit and evaluation of the University of Bridgeport Master of Science in Biology emphasis in Human Nutrition program offered in Toronto was conducted in May 1984. The consultant conducting the site-visit indicated that the program offered in Ontario met the same standards which applied to the program offered at the University of Bridgeport home campus in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Council is satisfied that the accreditation requirements specified in the Ministry's policy statement for degree granting institutions established in the United States have been met by the University of Bridgeport.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human

Nutrition program is directed at fully employed adult students whose current employment is relevant to the health care sector and who desire a background in human nutrition, its role in health and disease, and health care.

The program is offered in sessions lasting one full weekend, once per month. The program takes 18 months to complete in this fashion. A significant amount of independent reading and study is required, however there is no laboratory component to the program. The program is not designed to qualify graduates for entry into PhD programs because these are oriented toward research.

Applicants for admission to the Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program require a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university and are required to have completed a course in introductory biochemistry and a basic course in human anatomy and physiology.[17]

The bachelor degree requirement is waived for health practitioners who hold a medical degree requiring the equivalent of four years of professional education from an institution whose accrediting agency is recognized by the United States Office of Education. This requirement is also waived for those health practitioners who hold a valid state license or certificate to practice which required passing a state board examination and have completed at least 30 credits of pre-professional course work at an accredited college or university.[18]

The first cycle of the Master of Science program offered by the University of Bridgeport in Ontario from March 1983 to August 1984 had an enrolment of thirty-four students. Eleven students have graduated. The current cycle of the program, offered from September 1985 to February 1987, has an enrolment of 19 students. The largest group of students presently enrolled in the program are chiropractors (8). However, nurses (2), teachers (2), members of the pharmaceutical industry (2), doctors (1), hospital administrators (1), optometrists (1), dental hygenists (1), and pharmacists

---

[17] University of Bridgeport, Request for Renewal of Ministerial Consent, April 1, 1986, p. 13.

[18] Ibid., p. 13.

(1) are also enrolled in the program.[19]

The University of Bridgeport has projected an enrolment of 25 to 30 students per program offered in Ontario over the next five years. Three cycles of the program would be offered within this period of time, running from February 1987 to July 1988, from September 1988 to February 1990 and from February 1990 to July 1991.

In the submission of the University of Bridgeport, societal need for the Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program, was based on the need for "more effective and extensive nutrition education" and "the critical role of nutrition in health and disease, especially in the preventive aspects of certain chronic conditions, [which] has been recognized as a national concern in both Canada and the United States."[20] The University of Bridgeport suggests that the Master of Science in Biology emphasis in Human Nutrition program responds to the needs of society by:

> providing a scientifically based up to date program available to fully employed adults who are potential change makers, people who can apply sound nutritional principles in their special areas of interest and who can further educate the community.[21]

This program is not directed at students who wish to become registered dieticians or develop a career in research. The stated objective of the University of Bridgeport in offering this program is to "respond to widespread student interest in human nutrition" with a program which:

(1) Is based on physiologically and biochemically sound principles of nutrition;
(2) Offers students new and credible information in nutrition at the graduate level;

---

19. Ibid., p. 5.

20. Ibid., p. 5.

21. Ibid., p. 5.

(3) Centers on human nutrition in health and disease;
(4) Enables students to acquire an understanding of nutritional issues relevant to their area of specialization or interest;
(5) May serve as a foundation and structure for further studies in nutrition, but not designed to place its graduates into research oriented Ph.D. programs;
(6) Is accessible to qualified fully-employed adult students for whom a full-time program is out of the question;
(7) Is a scientifically based quality alternative to the highly selective, sophisticated, full-time research programs (generally of unquestioned quality) on the one hand, as well as an alternative to an alarming number of programs in nutrition of very dubious quality which are based entirely on anecdotal ramblings and/or fanaticism.[22]

Council, in its consideration of the societal need for this program, circulated the Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program to the University of Guelph and the University of Toronto, which both currently offer a Master of Science program in the area of nutrition, to determine the capacity of their graduate programs and whether the demands of Ontario residents for graduate studies in nutrition were being met.

Both the University of Guelph and the University of Toronto indicated that there is little or no similarity between the University of Bridgeport's program and their Master of Science or Master of Health Science programs in nutrition.[23] The Ontario programs have a significant research and laboratory component, are offered on a full-time basis and have on-campus residency requirements.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 3.

[23] Letter from Dr. J.R. MacDonald, Vice-President Academic, University of Guelph, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, July 7, 1986, and Letter from Dr. D.W. Lang, Assistant Vice-President (Planning) and University Registrar, University of Toronto, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, July 7, 1986.

Both the University of Guelph and the University of Toronto indicated in their submissions to Council that the University of Bridgeport Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program was most similar to their undergraduate nutrition programs with the exception that these undergraduate programs have a significant laboratory component which the graduate program of the University of Bridgeport does not have.

The two Ontario universities contacted indicated that they were not currently offering a similar program, however if a significant demand existed for a program at this level they indicated that such courses would be most appropriately offered within the context of an undergraduate certificate or diploma program in a part-time format.[24]

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

The University of Bridgeport, Master of Science, emphasis in Human Nutrition program is offered at the Residence Hall Amphitheatre of the Toronto General Hospital, located at 90 Gerrard Street West, under a space rental agreement which includes the use of a 35 millimeter slide projector and overhead projector equipment. As a non-research program, laboratory facilities are not required. Students with access to their own laboratory facilities, however, are free to incorporate the results of laboratory work into their projects.

Students enrolled in the program in Toronto have full access to the home campus library of the University of Bridgeport. A free phone-in reference service is available to Ontario students, and enables them to request library resources which are subsequently mailed to them, arrange inter-library loans, utilize an online database system and receive research advice from University of Bridgeport librarians.

---

[24] Ibid.

In addition to access to the library at the University of Bridgeport home campus, Ontario students also have full library privileges, and are considered primary users, at the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College in Toronto, with which the University of Bridgeport has a formal agreement. University of Bridgeport recommended readings are kept on reserve at the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College library.

Council is satisfied that the Ontario on-site facility and library services of the University of Bridgeport are adequate.

Recommendation

Council has reviewed the University of Bridgeport's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Master of Science in Biology emphasis in Human Nutrition program in Toronto.

Since the next cycle of the Master of Science in Biology, emphasis in Human Nutrition program will conclude in July 1988, Council believes that the renewal of the University of Bridgeport's Ministerial consent should be granted for a two year period to June 30, 1988.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-15 **MASTER OF SCIENCE IN BIOLOGY EMPHASIS IN HUMAN NUTRITION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT**

THAT, the University of Bridgeport be granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Master of Science in Biology emphasis in Human Nutrition in Toronto, Ontario for a period of two years from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1988.

Free University of Amsterdam

On November 23, 1984 the Free University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands was granted a Ministerial consent to offer its Doctor of Philosophy program in

Ontario, in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies of Toronto pursuant to subsection 2(e) of the Degree Granting Act, 1983, for the period up to August 31, 1986.

Council's assessment of the Free University of Amsterdam's application for a renewal of its consent is offered below.

1. Status in Home Jurisdiction

By letter of November 1, 1984 the Dutch Ministry of Education and Sciences confirmed to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities that "the Free University of Amsterdam is empowered to grant the Degree of Philosophy."[25]

Council is satisfied that the requirements specified in the Ministry's policy statement for a university or degree-granting institution established outside Canada or the United States of America, have been met by the Free University of Amsterdam and the Doctor of Philosophy program.

2. Societal Need and Student Demand

The Doctor of Philosophy program offered by the Free University of Amsterdam in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies focuses on foundational and methodological issues in philosophical studies, including the philosophy of history, theology, aesthetics, political theory and interdisciplinary philosophy.

The co-operative arrangement currently in place between the Free University of Amsterdam and the Institute for Christian Studies permits students at the Institute for Christian Studies to enrol in a program of doctoral study in Ontario which duplicates the course work, and comprehensive exam components of the Doctor of Philosophy program offered at the Free University of Amsterdam.

---

[25] Letter from Dr. R.J. in't Veld, Dutch Minister of Education and Sciences, to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, November 1, 1984.

This arrangement, although never formalized, has been in place since 1979. Students initially enrol at the Institute for Christian Studies and upon the completion of their comprehensive exams apply for admission to the Free University of Amsterdam. The Free University automatically accepts the level and type of work completed in Ontario as equivalent to its own, provided students have done the required amount of courses in the required subject areas. However, the Free University cannot offer a guarantee of acceptance to students who begin the program at the Institute for Christian Studies because the admission of foreign students to a Dutch university requires the approval of the Dutch Minister of Education.

The arrangement between the University of Amsterdam and the Institute for Christian Studies is based on:

> An agreement whereby ICS [Institute for Christian Studies] students who do post Master of Philosophical Foundations Studies at ICS according to an agreed formula will receive exemption by the Free University from all requirements for the PhD except for the writing of a dissertation, subject in each instance to the approval of the Dutch government.[26]

In practice, all students transferring from the program in Ontario to the program in the Netherlands have been approved by the Dutch Ministry.

The program requires a minimum of four years of study to be completed after the Master of Philosophical Foundations degree has been obtained. A minimum of two full years of study in residence is required prior to taking comprehensive exams at the Institute for Christian Studies. This is followed by at least two years spent researching and writing the doctoral dissertation. During their first year of course work students at the Institute for Christian Studies arrange for a supervisor from the Free University of Amsterdam to guide their program of study. If arrangements can be made for the thesis supervisor from the Free University to be in Ontario periodically during the stage at which a student has been admitted to the Free University and is researching and writing the thesis, then it may not be necessary for the student to go to Amsterdam to study, but only to make a short visit there in order to present the doctoral thesis.

---

[26] Institute for Christian Studies, Response to Request for Additional Information, June 18, 1986, p. 2.

The purpose of the Doctor of Philosophy program is:

> To help develop scholars who can become independent and contributing members of the academic community, competent to teach others, knowledgeable in philosophy, and ready to enhance Christian insight into learning.[27]

This doctoral studies program is intended for those individuals whose vocational goal is a life of scholarship and teaching in or related to philosophy or the philosophy of a particular field of study. Unlike an advanced degree taken at a seminary or theological college, where studies are intended primarily for the training of clergy, this program offers individuals who are pursuing an academic career in many different fields of study an opportunity to develop a Christian teaching perspective and Christian understanding of their life work. It creates an opportunity for those individuals wishing to approach an academic career from a Christian prospective to pursue this goal at an Ontario location for the majority of their doctoral studies.[28]

Four Ontario students have enrolled in the Free University of Amsterdam program offered at the Institute for Christian Studies since the first Ministerial consent was granted in 1984. One additional student has begun the first year course work pertaining to the Doctor of Philosophy program and will be formally admitted to the program when a tentative supervisor at the Free University has been located. An increase in enrolment is expected at a rate of two students per year.

Council is satisfied that student demand exists for this program and that it is meeting a societal need not presently being met by an Ontario institution.

---

[27] Institute for Christian Studies, Information Flyer re: Doctor of Philosophy Program.

[28] Free University of Amsterdam, Requested Information for Application for Ministerial Consent, May 1986, p. 1.

3. Ontario On-Site Facility and Library Services

During the two years of course work, comprehensive exams, and any researching and writing of the doctoral thesis required by the Free University of Amsterdam that is completed in Ontario, students utilize the physical facilities of the Institute for Christian Studies. The Institute for Christian Studies has seven full-time faculty and one part-time Associate Professor involved in the Doctor of Philosophy program.

Students and faculty of the Free University of Amsterdam's Doctor of Philosophy program offered at the Institute for Christian Studies have full access to a small library at the Institute for Christian Studies and to the Robarts Library at the University of Toronto. Library privileges extended by the University of Toronto library are subject to review every three to five years. Library user fees are covered by the Institute for Christian Studies.

Council is satisfied that the Ontario on-site facility and library services of the Free University of Amsterdam in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies are adequate.

Recommendation

Council has reviewed the Free University of Amsterdam's application for the renewal of its consent to offer the Doctor of Philosophy program in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto.

Council believes that the Free University of Amsterdam should be granted a conditional Ministerial consent for a period of ten months. Five conditions pertain to this consent and are as follows: that on all promotional material pertaining to the Doctor of Philosophy program, it must be indicated that this is a program of the Free University of Amsterdam offered in co-operation with and/or located at the Institute for Christian Studies, Toronto; that the required disclaimer is included on all promotional material relating to the program whether distributed by the Free University of Amsterdam or the Institute for Christian Studies; that the Ministry be made aware of any changes which are made to the Doctor of Philosophy program of the Free

University of Amsterdam offered in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies; that the Ministry be provided with a copy of any agreement formalizing or ratifying arrangements between the Free University of Amsterdam and the Institute for Christian Studies with respect to the Doctor of Philosophy program; and that the Free University of Amsterdam maintain its present degree-granting status in the Netherlands.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-16 **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE FREE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR CHRISTIAN STUDIES IN TORONTO**

THAT, the Free University of Amsterdam be granted a consent to offer its Doctor of Philosophy in Toronto, Ontario in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies for the period from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, on the condition that, during this period, on all promotional material pertaining to the Doctor of Philosophy program, it must be indicated that this is a program of the Free University of Amsterdam offered in co-operation with and/or located at the Institute for Christian Studies, Toronto; that the required disclaimer is included on all promotional material relating to the program whether distributed by the Free University of Amsterdam or the Institute for Christian Studies; that the Ministry be made aware of any changes which are made to the Doctor of Philosophy program of the Free University of Amsterdam offered in co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies; that the Ministry be provided with a copy of any agreement formalizing or ratifying arrangements between the Free University of Amsterdam and the Institute for Christian Studies with respect to the Doctor of Philosophy program; and that the Free University

of Amsterdam maintain its present degree-granting status in the Netherlands.

Conclusion

The recommendations contained in this Memorandum complete Council's consideration of applications for the renewal of existing Ministerial consents evaluated against the criteria outlined in the Ministry's policy statement of November 1985 re: The Granting of Ministerial Consents as authorized by the Degree Granting Act, 1983.

Council has gained many insights into the existing policy as a result of reviewing the eight applications for renewal of consent, and now has a number of serious reservations about the criteria themselves. In particular, the issue of program quality may not be appropriately addressed.

In due course, therefore, Council intends to share with the Minister its views on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing policy statement which guide the evaluation of applications for Ministerial consents.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

July 18, 1986

86-V FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR PROGRAMS AT ALGOMA COLLEGE, LE COLLEGE DE HEARST AND NIPISSING COLLEGE

Introduction

On January 13, 1986, the President of Laurentian University wrote to the Chairman of Council expressing concerns about the funding arrangements for Laurentian University programs offered at Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and Nipissing College. The President recommended that the existing funding arrangements be adjusted to address these concerns. In this memorandum Council reviews the background to the existing funding arrangements for programs offered at Laurentian affiliates, current problems with these arrangements and recommends appropriate modifications.

Existing Funding Arrangements

In Advisory Memorandum 79-III, Council recommended, and the Minister accepted, the current funding arrangements for students enrolled at Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and Nipissing College in programs offered by Laurentian University but not approved for direct funding to the affiliates. These students are reported for funding as Laurentian University enrolments, with the formula and non-formula grants applicable to these enrolments being transferred to the appropriate College by Laurentian.[1] Council described the policy and rationale for recommending the current approach as follows:

> ...Council was guided by the fact that among Laurentian University and its affiliates, only Laurentian is authorized to offer the B.Com., B.S.W. and honours B.A. programs. Council does not propose that such authorization be extended to the affiliates but recognizes that the Colleges can offer programs on behalf of and as authorized by Laurentian University. Under such an arrangement, students would be enrolled at the appropriate

---

[1] For a summary of the history of the funding arrangements of the Laurentian affiliates see: Ontario Council on University Affairs, Advisory Memorandum 79-III, Sixth Annual Report, 1979-80, pp. 56-57.

> College but registered as Laurentian students, reported for funding purposes by Laurentian University and funded at the appropriate program weight. The funds received by Laurentian from the Ministry would then be transferred to the Colleges providing the instruction. It should, of course, be understood that there would be no change from the present funding arrangements for the three year arts program at Algoma, Hearst and Nipissing and the Bachelor of Education program at Nipissing.[2]

At that time Council indicated that this approach would meet several important requirements:

> First, the Colleges will offer and be funded directly for only those programs for which they have already received ministerial approval. Second, the funding weight for the partial B.Com., B.S.W. and honours B.A. programs will be the same regardless of the institution providing the instruction. Third, the arrangement will reaffirm, that, among Laurentian University and its affiliates, Laurentian is currently the only degree-granting institution. Fourth, the Laurentian affiliates will receive the funding which is appropriate to the programs in which they provide instruction.[3]

The adoption of this approach has resulted in the establishment of what commonly is known as "pseudo-campus" reporting where it is necessary for the university to use separate reporting codes for each college in order to report the affiliates' enrolment in the programs not eligible for direct funding.

Current Problems

Laurentian indicates that two basic problems arise out of this funding arrangement. The first is the administrative complexity of this funding arrangement:

> The Laurentian reporting system is already complex because of the need to report for the Affiliated

---

[2] Ibid., p. 58.

[3] Ibid., p. 58.

Colleges and is made even more complex by the necessity to segregate the reporting of the enrolment in Laurentian programs at the Affiliated Colleges.

In addition to the enrolment reporting, further complexity is added to the process by the need for Laurentian to keep separate records for the base periods and moving averages for each of the "pseudo-campuses" in order that a portion of formula grants and the Northern Grant paid to Laurentian can be passed on to the appropriate affiliated college. Further to the complications of reporting and formula calculations, transfers of funds must be made twice per month to each of the three colleges. All this makes for a very complex and administratively cumbersome process.[4]

The second problem is related to the effect of pseudo-campus reporting on the accuracy of enrolment and funding data used and distributed in the Ontario university system:

> ...Reporting of enrolment in these programs and the resulting funding is regularly included with the Laurentian figures rather than being shown separately or included with the applicable affiliated college. This includes reports issued by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and by the Council of Ontario Universities. As the enrolment in these programs has grown considerably over the past few years, this reporting is presenting very misleading data on the enrolment and funding of the respective institutions...[5]

Council concurs with Laurentian's position that the current policy has proven to be somewhat cumbersome and has created unforeseen data problems when assessing the enrolment and funding situations of Laurentian and its affiliates. Such problems are unintended complications of the current policy and should be rectified.

---

4. Letter from Dr. J. S. Daniel to Mrs. M. Paikin, January 13, 1986, p. 2.

5. Ibid., p. 2.

Modifications to the Current Funding Arrangements

Council believes that a resolution of Laurentian's concerns should maintain the principles underlying the current policy outlined above. Most importantly, the current policy effectively reaffirms that, among Laurentian University and its affiliates, Laurentian is currently the only degree-granting institution and that the affiliates offer and are funded directly for only those programs for which they have already received ministerial approval. The thrust of these principles must continue to be supported despite any simplification of the reporting process.

Laurentian suggests that this can be accomplished if:

> ...Laurentian University were to formally request to Council and to the Ministry that the enrolment at the Affiliated Colleges in programs approved by the Laurentian Senate be included for reporting purposes as enrolment of the respective colleges and that funding with respect to this enrolment be provided directly to the Colleges. Thereafter each time a new program is approved for offering at an Affiliated College, Laurentian will request direct funding approval from Council and the Ministry. This would eliminate the need for separate "pseudo-campus" reporting.[6]

Council believes that the approach suggested has merit. However, Council is concerned that this approach may compromise the first requirement outlined in Advisory Memorandum 79-III, namely, that the Colleges will offer and be funded directly for only those programs for which they have already received ministerial approval. Under the suggested approach, approval by the Minister of the direct transfer of funding could be interpreted either as ministerial approval for these types of programs or as direct funding to programs which have not received ministerial approval. In either case it would be a departure from the intentions outlined in Advisory Memorandum 79-III.

Council continues to believe that it is appropriate for Laurentian's affiliates to be limited in the scope of programs approved for funding by the Minister with the remaining programs being provided on behalf of

---

[6] Ibid., p. 3.

Laurentian. Council is persuaded, however, that this can be achieved without the funding and reporting arrangements currently in place. Under the approach suggested by Laurentian, emphasis must be placed on the formal request by Laurentian University for reporting the current "pseudo-campus" enrolments as affiliated college enrolments. At a minimum Council will require that the University indicate, in its request for direct funding, that this funding is for a Laurentian program offered at an affiliated college on behalf of Laurentian University. Council's review of the request for direct funding will not be *pro forma* and may require additional information before a funding recommendation is made to the Minister.

Council proposes that the process should be structured in the following manner. Upon approval by the Laurentian Senate of a program to be offered, in whole or in part, at the Laurentian affiliates, the University will submit to Council a request that the enrolment be included for reporting purposes as enrolment of the respective colleges and that funding with respect to this enrolment be provided directly to the colleges. The University will also indicate that the program is a Laurentian University program offered at an affiliated college on behalf of Laurentian University. Council will review the request submitted and make a recommendation to the Minister on the funding and enrolment reporting associated with the program. The Minister will then be able to decide whether direct funding is appropriate. This process will be necessary for all enrolments now reported as Laurentian (Algoma), Laurentian (Hearst) and Laurentian (Nipissing), Laurentian programs newly offered at an affiliate for which the affiliate does not have Ministerial approval and any new programs not captured by Council's undergraduate program approval process.

In light of these considerations, Council accordingly recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-17 **FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS NOW AUTHORIZED TO BE OFFERED BY ALGOMA COLLEGE, LE COLLEGE DE HEARST AND NIPISSING COLLEGE**

THAT, funding continue to be provided by the Government directly to Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and

Nipissing College for enrolment in three-year general arts programs, to Algoma College and Nipissing College for enrolment in the first-year science program and to Nipissing College for enrolment in the undergraduate degree program in education.

OCUA 86-18 **FUNDING FOR OTHER LAURENTIAN PROGRAMS OFFERED AT ALGOMA COLLEGE, LE COLLEGE DE HEARST AND NIPISSING COLLEGE ON BEHALF OF LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY**

THAT, the process for approval of direct funding for other programs be in accordance with the principles and procedures prescribed in this memorandum.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

September 19, 1986

86-VI THE ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM 1987-88

Introduction

In this memorandum, Council submits its advice for 1987-88 on the value, number and distribution of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS) awards. This advice is rendered in accordance with Council's long-term objectives for the OGS program as outlined in Advisory Memorandum 85-VI, The Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program, 1986-87:

1. To encourage excellence in graduate studies within the Ontario university system.
2. To foster the presence of a minimum number of outstanding graduate students in specific smaller universities.
3. To ensure the presence of a minimum number of outstanding visa graduate students within the Ontario university system.

Advisory Memorandum 85-VI was based on a long-term review of the OGS program. The arguments and analysis underlying the recommendations in that memorandum remain the basis of Council's current position. Therefore, Council does not undertake to reiterate the underlying details of it in this year's memorandum.

Scholarship Stipend Value

In response to Advisory Memorandum 85-VI, the Minister announced on August 8, 1986 that the value of the OGS stipend for 1986-87 would increase from the 1985-86 level of $7,305 or $2,435 per term to $8,760 or $2,920 per term. This represents a 20% increase in the value of the award. Council applauds the Government's increased funding of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship program. In Advisory Memorandum 85-VI, Council recommended that the value of the OGS award be increased to 80% of the average value of the Federal Government scholarships made through the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Council continues to believe that the OGS should be competitively funded in relation to the value of these awards. Table I illustrates the value of the OGS, NSERC and SSHRC awards since 1974-75.

TABLE I

COMPARATIVE SCHOLARSHIP STIPENDS

	OGS	NSERC PGS Awards[1]	SSHRC Doctoral Scholarship	OGS % of NSERC/SSHRC Average Value
1974-75	$3,400[2]	$4,500	$4,000	80.0
1975-76	$3,400[2]	$5,000	$5,000	68.0
1976-77	$3,750	$5,520	$5,500	68.1
1977-78	$4,350	$6,000	$6,000	72.5
1978-79	$4,500	$6,360	$6,360	70.8
1979-80	$4,800	$7,000	$6,750	69.8
1980-81	$4,890	$8,500	$7,860	59.8
1981-82	$5,700	$9,350	$8,760	63.0
1982-83	$6,270	$10,500	$9,720	62.0
1983-84	$6,585	$11,100	$10,800	60.1
1984-85	$6,915	$11,600	$11,340	60.3
1985-86	$7,305	$11,600	$11,640	62.9
1986-87	$8,760	$11,600	$12,000	74.2

1. NSERC post-graduate scholarship (PGS) values are those in effect in the Fall of each academic year.
2. Adjusted to take account of the integration of fees into the award in 1976-77.

For 1986-87, the OGS stipend is 74.2% of the average value of the NSERC and SSHRC awards.

Council notes the significant improvement in the comparative value of the OGS award for 1986. However, in order to restore the OGS program to its original level of prestige, importance and effectiveness Council maintains that the award value of OGS should be increased to 80% of the average value of the NSERC and SSHRC awards. Using 1986 NSERC and SSHRC values, and accounting for an estimated inflation factor of 3.8% for 1987-88, the value of the OGS stipend for 1987-88 should be $9,798 or $3,266 per term, an increase of 11.9%.

Accordingly Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-19 **ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP STIPENDS 1987-88**

THAT, in 1987-88, Ontario Graduate Scholarships carry a minimum stipend value of $9,798 or $3,266 per term.

Number of Awards

As indicated in Table II, the total number of awards available has been maintained at 1,200 since 1978-79. Council is concerned with the increasing disparity between the number of qualified applicants and the number of stipends awarded. During the period 1978-79 to 1986-87 the number of applications has increased 29.2% resulting in a decline in the proportion of applicants supported by the program, from 23.8% in 1978-79 to 16.7% in 1986-87. The greatest application pressures have come from the biological sciences, applied sciences, and social sciences, with overall increases, since 1978-79 of 52.2%, 38.9%, and 34.6% respectively.

Although Council believes that there is a need for the OGS program to increase the total number of stipends awarded in order to more effectively encourage, reward and retain excellent graduate students in Ontario, Council continues to accord the highest priority to an immediate increase in stipend value. Therefore, Council believes that the total number of stipends awarded should be at least 1,200.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-20 **NUMBER OF ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR 1987-88**

THAT, in 1987-88, at least 1,200 Ontario Graduate Scholarships be made available for:

(a) open competition;
(b) institutional awards; and
(c) visa students

TABLE II

NUMBER OF OGS AWARDS
(by category)

	Open	Institutional	Visa/LI	Total
1974-75	850	150	(Quota)[2]	1,000
1975-76	850	150	(Quota)[2]	1,000
1976-77	850	150	(Quota)[2]	1,000
1977-78	850	45	50	945
1978-79	1,105	45	50	1,200
1979-80	1,095	45	60	1,200
1980-81	1,095	45	60	1,200
1981-82	910	40	50	1,000
1982-83	1,095	45	60	1,200
1983-84	1,095	45	60	1,200
1984-85	1,095	45	60	1,200
1985-86	1,095	45	60[3]	1,200
1986-87	1,095	45	60	1,200

---

1. LI = Recent Landed Immigrant.

2. Up to 10% of the awards could be allocated to landed immigrants or holders of student visas.

3. Reflecting acceptance of Recommendation 83-4 this category is now restricted only to visa students.

Institutional Awards

In Advisory Memorandum 85-VI, Council endorsed the continuation of institutional awards for Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian and Trent universities. Council considers these awards to be vitally important to the maintenance of graduate activity at these institutions. Council notes that the significant number of OGS awards attracted by Wilfrid Laurier University, in addition to their institutional awards, suggested that the institutional award category is no longer a crucial factor to the graduate enterprise there and should be eliminated. The Minister deferred a decision on this recommendation, pending the receipt of a review of institutional awards from the Chairman of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship Selection Board. Council understands that the Minister is now in receipt of this information and will be in a position to consider Council's recommendation at this time.

Council reiterates its support for the distribution of institutional awards as detailed in Advisory Memorandum 85-VI. Council believes it necessary that a certain number of awards be reserved for institutions which require them in order to preserve a minimum number of outstanding graduate students within their graduate enterprises. Toward this end, Council recommends that a total of 40 awards be evenly distributed among Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian and Trent universities. Council intends to monitor closely the total number of awards obtained by Wilfrid Laurier and should a significant decline occur in the number of awards held there, Council is prepared to review its current position.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-21 **INSTITUTIONAL AWARDS TO UNIVERSITIES WITHOUT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**

THAT, 40 scholarships (10 per university) be deemed institutional awards in 1987-88 for the following universities: Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian and Trent.

Visa Student Awards

Council continues to advocate that a certain number of awards be set aside in 1987-88 for outstanding visa students.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-22 **ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS TO PERSONS ON STUDENT VISAS**

THAT, 60 scholarships be reserved for persons who at the time of application are student visa holders.

The effect of recommendations 86-21 and 86-22 would mean that 1,100 awards would be made available within the open competition.

Conclusion

The OGS program is a vital element of Government's commitment to the identification and reward of excellence and relevance in academic endeavours within the province of Ontario. Council is convinced that the recommendations in this memorandum will help restore the OGS program to its original level of prestige, importance and effectiveness.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

October 17, 1986

86-VII MODIFICATION OF THE OPERATING GRANTS FORMULA

Introduction

On October 25, 1985, the Minister of Colleges and Universities indicated that the formula distribution arrangements for 1987-88 and beyond needed to be clarified. In this memorandum, Council recommends a new operating grants allocative mechanism for 1987-88 and beyond.

Evolution of the Operating Grants Formula

In the initial years of the formula's existence, operating grants were calculated on the basis of the current year's enrolment. That is, for a given year, a dollar value for the Basic Income Unit (BIU) was established and then the operating grant to each institution was determined by multiplying that value by the total number of BIUs claimed by the institution in that year. Since then, however, the formula has been modified to reduce the direct relationship between enrolment and funding.

For funding in 1973-74, a change was made to a "slip-year" count of BIUs. Specifically, the operating grant for a given year was determined by multiplying the BIU value by the total number of BIUs in the institution in the immediately preceding year. This change was made so that institutions would know their operating grant income prior to the start of the fiscal year rather than having to wait until part-way through the year.

Undergraduate Funding - 1976-77 to 1983-84

In Advisory Memorandum 75-II ("Formula Revision: The Question of Formula Sensitivity to Changes in Enrolment"), Council gave notice that it was "seriously contemplating options whereby formula funding might become less sensitive to enrolment changes...."[1] Subsequently, in Advisory Memorandum 75-VII, Council initiated "a gradual process whereby the formula that remains ongoing in the undergraduate sector can acquire some reduced sensitivity to enrolment change". Council embarked on this course after discussions with the institutions because, as it said at the time:

---

[1] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Second Annual Report, 1975-76, p. 20.

> ...fiscal stability sufficient to maintain service levels (should be) accorded a measure of priority over growth and...accessibility of the university system to student members (should be) hedged by a genuine concern for the quality of a student's university experience. In a context of limited financial resources, there is evident support for reduced sensitivity to enrolment changes...[2]

The first step in this process was taken for 1976-77. The "slip-year" approach was changed to a distribution in accordance with a two-year average in which one-third weight was assigned to BIUs reported in 1974-75 and a two-thirds weight to those reported in 1975-76. The second step was implemented for 1977-78 funding when undergraduate formula grants were distributed in accordance with a three-year average in which the number of BIUs reported in each of 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 were weighted equally. Thus, over a two-year period, there was a shift to a three-year average in order to reduce enrolment sensitivity.

The third (and final) step in the process, implemented for the 1978-79 fiscal year, was proposed by Council in Advisory Memorandum 76-VII ("Formula Sensitivity to Undergraduate Enrolment Change"). Noting that its "advice on a formula allocation mechanism should be consistent with the advice it offers on global funding of the university system", Council

> ...concluded that the most appropriate means...is to have recourse to an annually moving average whose difference from a stated base could be discounted by a variable percentage that reflected the treatment accorded to the growth component of global funding.[3]

Thus, for 1978-79, undergraduate formula grants were distributed in accordance with the number of undergraduate BIUs in a fixed base (established as the average number of BIUs in 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77) plus 50% of the difference between the average number of BIUs in the fixed base and the average number of BIUs in a three-year moving average (for 1978-79: 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78). For subsequent years the fixed base remained unchanged but the three-year moving average moved forward year by year. This formula remained in place until the end of 1983-84.

---

[2] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Second Annual Report, 1975-76, pp. 61-62.

[3] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Third Annual Report, 1976-77, pp. 51-52.

Graduate Funding - 1976-77 to 1983-84

In Advisory Memorandum 75-V ("Graduate Program Planning and Formula Revision"), Council noted that there was:

> ...a clear need to suspend the existing formula with respect to graduate work in 1976-77, and to maintain this suspension for a period of at least two and possibly three years, during which the entire basis for funding graduate work can be searchingly re-examined.[4]

Hence, Council recommended, in Advisory Memorandum 75-VII, that funding for graduate work in 1976-77 and 1977-78 "be allocated in accordance with the distribution of eligible graduate [BIUs] reported in 1975-76, these units to be designated during the period of suspension as Graduate Funding Units".[5] One effect of this action was that graduate BIUs acquired a value that was only 97.5% of the value of undergraduate BIUs.

Subsequently, in Advisory Memorandum 77-VII ("Graduate Program Planning and Funding"), Council responded to the institutions' "need to know what funding mechanism would come into effect at the end of the period of formula suspension in order for them to proceed with planning for the first [graduate planning] quinquennium".[6] Council signalled its intention to recommend, beginning in 1979-80, as follows:

---

[4] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Second Annual Report, 1975-76, pp. 34-35.

[5] Ibid., p. 60.

[6] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Fourth Annual Report, 1977-78, p. 58.

a) For Masters and graduate diploma programs, "the formula currently in use for the funding of undergraduate programs" was to be employed, and

b) For Doctoral programs, Council favoured, "a mechanism which...employs a fixed base enrolment and a three-year moving average enrolment" but incorporates a "discount/stability factor" of two-thirds (rather than one-half).

The different discounting factor for doctoral programs was suggested in order to provide a "high level of stability designed, in part, to protect funding for research and scholarship".[7]

These proposed arrangements were formally recommended in Advisory Memorandum 78-III ("Graduate Program Planning and Funding") and the fixed base for graduate funding was established using the same three-year period (1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77) as was used for undergraduate funding.[8] This formula remained in place until the end of 1983-84.

Undergraduate and Graduate Funding - 1984-85 to 1986-87

In Advisory Memorandum 82-XV, Council recommended the adoption of a new formula which treated undergraduate and graduate enrolment in the same fashion. The primary focus of this formula revision was to allocate formula grants according to constant shares. This was tempered by a funding floor below which an institution began to lose formula grant income. With this formula Council intended:

a) to eliminate the erosion of grant revenue accruing to "steady-state" institutions which results from enrolment increases in other institutions,

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 61-62.

[8] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Fifth Annual Report, 1978-79, p. 68.

b) to reduce the disparity in annual revenue increases among institutions,

c) to reduce the likelihood of aggressive competition for enrolment among institutions in the face of the projected decline in the traditional university age-group population, and,

d) to retain some measure of enrolment sensitivity through the medium of tuition fee revenue.[9]

In May 1983, the Minister of Colleges and Universities rejected Council's advice on formula revision. Since that time, the formula grants mechanism has been in a state of flux and uncertainty.

On December 16, 1983, the Minister announced a new operating grants formula to be phased in over three years beginning in 1984-85.[10] At about the same time, the Minister announced the establishment of the Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario. As part of its terms of reference the Commission was instructed to address:

> ...the method of distribution of university operating grants with a view to ensuring an adequate and measurable basis for public accountability while enabling the universities to remain autonomous in the governance of their affairs and ensuring that their responsibilities as institutions of higher education are discharged with integrity.[11]

In January 1985, the Commission recommended a multi-faceted formula based on a three-level corridors approach to allocating formula grants. Depending on their degree of research intensity, institutions were accorded a corridor of ±4%, ±6% or ±8%.

---

[9] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Ninth Annual Report, 1982-83, p. 160.

[10] See Appendix B of Advisory Memorandum 83-IX, OCUA's Tenth Annual Report, 1983-84, pp. 85-86, for a description of the new formula.

[11] The Commission on the Future Development of the University of Ontario, Ontario Universities: Options and Future, December, 1984, - Terms of Reference.

On January 21, 1985, Council recommended that, pending consideration of the report of the Commission, it was inappropriate to continue the phase-in of the Minister's formula which might be replaced by another formula. The Minister accepted this judgment and, for 1985-86, the phase-in was halted at the first-year configuration of one-third of the grants allocated according to the "new" formula and two-thirds of the grants allocated according to the "old" formula. On October 25, 1985, the Minister indicated that Government had not accepted the operating grants allocation mechanism proposed by the Commission and sought advice from Council on a new allocative mechanism. On November 27, 1985, Council recommended that, in the interim, the formula remain at its first year configuration with a floor provision of 3.5%. The Minister accepted this judgment for allocating operating grants for 1986-87.

The current state of uncertainty about the operating grants formula cannot continue. It is clear to Council that adequate planning in universities requires a more permanent and stable formula. Council has undertaken an extensive review of the objectives of the formula and has assessed numerous mechanisms to achieve these objectives. As a result of these considerations it recommends major changes in the operating grants formula and in the array of extra-formula grants for the next several years.

Proposed Modifications to the Operating Grants Allocation Formula

Council begins by reaffirming its objectives for the operating grants formula as outlined previously in Advisory Memorandum 77-VII, The Ontario University System: A Statement of Issues, and reiterated in Advisory Memorandum 82-XV:

1) funding stability by preventing extreme fluctuations in institutional income,

2) funding predictability to assist institutions in their planing efforts,

3) equitable allocations among institutions

4) accountability to the public by linking funds to some quantifiable factor, and

5) a method that is simple to use, understandable and practical to implement.

In reaffirming these objectives, Council recognizes that the importance of each objective changes over time according to the circumstances faced by the university system and Government. Earlier this year, before determining the direction of change in the allocative mechanism, Council consulted with the university system on the priority that should be attached to each of these objectives. In general, institutions attached highest priority to funding stability and/or equitable allocation rather than to the other objectives. Council concurs with the priority attached to these objectives.

A. Direction of Change in the Operating Grants Allocative Mechanism

The primary direction for formula revision chosen by Council is enhanced funding stability in order to achieve the following aims:

(a) protect institutions' funding from the impact of the actions of other institutions;

(b) reduce the incentive for institutions to use growth only for the purpose of increasing their share of total operating grants;

(c) provide the opportunity for quality considerations as well as for quantity considerations in academic decisions; and,

(d) reduce short-term variations in funding which may result from fluctuating enrolment patterns in future years.

A secondary direction undertaken in this formula revision is to address some of the concerns raised by institutions about the fairness of the current formula in recognizing individual institutional needs. Council undertook to address these concerns only if there were new funds available to support adjustments. Such adjustments should not be made in a zero-sum situation where they result in reductions in funding for other underfunded institutions.

In Advisory Memorandum 86-II, Council recommended that funding be provided for this purpose. The Minister, on November 3, 1986, announced that funds had been made available for Council to address concerns about the recognition of expanded instructional and research activity and the special needs of northern institutions. Thus, Council has two additional aims for its formula revision related to instructional concerns:

(a) to provide appropriate recognition for relative changes in past levels of activity by adjusting the level of funding with due regard to the past legacy of funding patterns, and,

(b) to adjust institutional funding over the long term, in relation to changing levels of activity.

B. Structural Framework

Council's recommended formula revision is a multi-faceted system of operating grant mechanisms, with a number of different functions, but integrated in total impact. It is based on an "envelope" approach to operating grants allocation. Five separate envelopes have been designated:

(1) formula grants;

(2) enrolment/accessibility adjustments;

(3) research overheads/infrastructure funding;

(4) mission-related institution-specific funding

  (a) institutional weights (Ryerson and OCA),
  (b) Northern mission,
  (c) differentiation,
  (d) bilingualism; and

(5) program adjustments.

Council views these envelopes as an integrated package of operating grants allocation mechanisms. They should not be viewed in isolation. For example, enrolment/accessibility adjustments are integrally related to the formula grants distribution. Similarly, program adjustment funding is critical to the on-going working of the formula grants mechanism. While such an integrated approach may add somewhat to the complexity of the operating grants allocation it does, in Council's view, provide for a more responsive and equitable allocation of operating grants.

Some of the new envelopes will be temporary, with the bulk of the funds eventually being transferred into the formula grants envelope. Other envelopes will be more permanent and become the basis for extra-formula allocation for several years.

C. Formula Grants Envelope

Under the proposed formula revision, the primary method of allocating operating grants will continue to be through formula grants. Council's primary aim for formula revision, enhanced funding stability, is dealt with in this envelope as are some of the more long-term aspects of its equity aims.

In its exploration of the appropriate mechanism for formula grants distribution Council identified three criteria which the new formula must meet:

(a) **There should be little, if any, loss of income for an institution as a result of the introduction of the new formula.** In this regard, Council decided that the appropriate base from which to begin is the 1986-87 allocation of formula grants. The many factors which influenced the size of the grant allocation in 1986-87 (discounting, floor, or the blending of the "old" and "new" formulas) are disregarded. The equity problems associated with the 1986-87 allocation are dealt with in separate envelopes and, where necessary, will be phased into the formula grants envelope.

(b) **In the short-term, funding should be stable and less sensitive to changes in enrolment.** Enhanced stability in the distribution of funds is the primary objective of Council's formula revision. The formula must be able to protect, for a reasonable period of time, an institution's funding from the impact of other institutions' actions and dampen the funding impact of interyear fluctuations in enrolment.

(c) In the longer-term, funding should be flexible and allow for appropriate adjustments to changing levels of activity as well as allow for planning or co-ordinating initiatives. While the primary objective of Council's formula revision is to ensure stable funding for institutions, there must be a limit to such stability. Additional objectives such as equity and accountability must be taken into account. Over time, the levels of activity undertaken by institutions are bound to change. The formula must be able to allow for long-term gradual adjustments in funding in order to recognize such shifts in responsibility. It is important to limit the need for extraordinary equity adjustments in the future.

Council sees funding stability more as a short-term objective (up to 5 to 7 years), while the need for funding flexibility is of long-term importance. This flexibility, however, must be tempered to discourage undesirable competition for enrolment by institutions trying to maintain or increase their share of total formula grants.

Overview of the Proposed Mechanism

Council recommends that the formula mechanism operate in the following manner:

(i) To begin with, each institution's formula grant will equal its 1986-87 formula grants.

(ii) Institutions will continue to receive approximately this level of "real" formula grants so long as their "moving-average" of Basic Income Units (BIUs) remains in a corridor of ±3%.[12] The only variation in an institution's funding will be the tuition fees gained or lost by varying levels of enrolment.

---

[12] This assumes that total formula grants and formula fee rates increase annually at the same rate. If the percentage increases in total formula grants and formula fee rates differ, the rate of increase in formula grants may vary among institutions according to the proportion of BOI funded by fees at each institution. In this context "real" formula grants refers to the 1986-87 formula grants escalated by the annual increase in system-wide formula grants.

(iii) When an institution's moving-average BIUs fall below its corridor, it will have its BOI, and hence formula grants, reduced in line with the decline in BIUs. With the agreement of Council, the institution may negotiate for the establishment of a new corridor lower than its current one at a lower level of formula grants to avail itself of the funding stability inherent within a corridor. A new corridor would be based on an agreed plan. The institution would be able to approach Council prior to or after going below its floor. Council would recommend any agreed change to the Minister for approval.

(iv) When an institution's moving-average BIUs go above its corridor it will receive no automatic increase in formula grants but will retain all incremental tuition fees. With the agreement of Council, and if it approaches Council **prior to** going above its ceiling, the institution may negotiate the establishment of a new corridor above its current level at a higher level of formula grants. A new corridor would be based on an agreed plan. Council would recommend any agreed change to the Minister for approval.

(v) The initial formula grants entitlement will be adjusted as the enrolment/accessibility and institutional weights adjustments are applied.

Detailed Description of the Proposed Mechanism

In the following sections, Council provides a detailed description of the proposed formula mechanism. It is described under the following headings indicating the rationale behind each section of the formula: (a) Starting Point, (b) Short-term Stability Mechanism, (c) Long-term Flexibility, and (d) Final Grant Calculation.

(a) Starting Point

As outlined above, Council's first criterion for the new formula is that 'there should be little, if any, loss of income as a result of the introduction of the formula'. This criterion is fulfilled by making the starting-point for determining future formula grants the 1986-87 array of formula grants (defined as the initial **Base Grants**). Similarly, those factors that determine formula grant allocations in future years - BOI, BIUs and formula fees - have base lines defining their starting-points. **Base BOI**, **Base BIUs** and **Base Formula Fees** are used as reference points for future allocations. These are defined below.

(i) Base BOI

Base BOI is the sum of **Base Grants** and **Base Formula Fees**. An institution's **Base BOI** is initially calculated by adding its 1986-87 formula grants (initial **Base Grants**) and **Base Formula Fees**. In subsequent years, each institution's **Base BOI** is escalated by the percentage increase in total system **Base BOI**.[13] The array of **Base BOI** will be altered as enrolment/accessibility adjustments and institutional weight adjustments are applied or when a new level of **Base BOI** is negotiated with Council.

(ii) Base Formula Fees

Base Formula Fees are defined as an institution's three-year average of 1983-84, 1984-85 and 1985-86 formula fees. **Base Formula Fee** levels are escalated annually by the annual increase in formula fee rates. An institution's **Base Formula Fees** will be adjusted in accordance with any adjustment in **Base BIUs** negotiated with Council or, in the case of Ryerson and OCA, when their institutional fee rate is changed.

(iii) Base Grants

The 1986-87 level of formula grants is the **Base Grants** level to which future formula grants are tied. In 1987-88, **Base Grants** for each institution will equal each institution's 1987-88 **Base BOI** minus their 1987-88 **Base Formula Fees**. In subsequent years, the array of **Base Grants** allocated will be altered as enrolment/-

---

[13] For example, total system Base BOI in 1987-88 = 1987-88 total formula grants + (1986-87 Base Formula Fees x 1.04 [the fee rate increase for 1987-88]).

accessibility adjustments and institutional weight adjustments are phased-in or when a new level of **Base BOI** is negotiated with Council. If total formula grants and formula fee rates increase at the same rate, the level of **Base Grants** for each institution will be escalated annually by the global increase in formula grants.

(iv) Base BIUs

Base BIUs are defined as an institution's three-year average of 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86 total BIUs.

(b) Short-term Stability Mechanism

Council's second criterion - 'in the short-term, funding should be stable and less sensitive to changes in enrolment' - is dealt with in two ways. First, the impact that any one year of enrolment has on the formula grants allocation in a particular year is severely dampened by averaging that year's BIUs with those of a number of other years. Second, a corridor is set around each institution's **Base BIUs**. When an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** are located in this corridor, the institution receives formula grants equal to its **Base Grants** level.

(i) Moving-Average BIUs

Council recommends that a **slip-year 7-year moving-average** of BIUs (total undergraduate and graduate BIUs) be used to dampen the effects of enrolment change. A 7-year moving-average implies that the BIUs found in any particular year will have an impact of approximately 14% in a given year of funding. However, the enrolment growth that has occurred in the past 7 years creates for some institutions a sizeable discontinuity between their **Base BIUs** and their 7-year average of BIUs. Therefore, this moving-average will be phased in by growing from the **Base BIU** average to the full 7-year average when it will begin to move one year at a time. The phase-in is as follows:

Funding Year	Average BIUs
1987-88	$\frac{1983\text{-}84 + 1984\text{-}85 + 1985\text{-}86 + 1986\text{-}87}{4}$
1988-89	$\frac{1983\text{-}84 + 1984\text{-}85 + \ldots + 1987\text{-}88}{5}$
1989-90	$\frac{1983\text{-}84 + 1984\text{-}85 + \ldots + 1988\text{-}89}{6}$
1990-91	$\frac{1983\text{-}84 + 1984\text{-}85 + \ldots + 1989\text{-}90}{7}$
1991-92	$\frac{1984\text{-}85 + 1985\text{-}86 + \ldots + 1990\text{-}91}{7}$

Moving-average Formula Fees include the same years as **Moving-average BIUs**.

(ii) Corridor

To further dampen the effects of short-term enrolment fluctuations and protect the funding of institutions from the impact of enrolment changes at other institutions, a corridor is set around each institution's level of **Base BIUs**. Within this corridor, enrolment change is discounted by 100%. If an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** in any particular year fall within the corridor range, the institution is funded according to its level of **Base BOI**. This implies that an institution will receive formula grants according to the level of its **Base Grants**. The institution's **Base Grants** become its **Eligible Grants**.[14] In this range of BIUs, BOI and formula grants allocation is decoupled from current levels of BIUs and formula fees. If an institution's enrolment increases or decreases within the corridor, grants are not adjusted for the gain or loss in formula fees associated with these students.

---

[14] Eligible Grants refer to the grant level used in the final calculation of formula grants entitlement of an institution. It can equal either Base Grants or Moving-average Grants. More specifically, when:

Moving-average BIUs $\geq$ 0.97 Base BIUs then:

Eligible Grants = Base Grants

(See Final Grant Calculation section for a more detailed explanation of Eligible Grants)

Council explored several alternative approaches to corridors. It examined treating undergraduate and graduate enrolments differentially by applying a wider corridor at the graduate level to reflect a perceived need to have greater funding stability for these programs. Some anomalous results were discovered when this concept was examined in detail. If undergraduate and graduate enrolments are treated in isolation in order to vary corridor widths, it was found that the situation could arise at an institution where there could be increasing enrolment at one level and decreasing enrolment at the other, resulting in an increase in total BIUs and enrolment and a decline in total formula grants. This problem can be overcome by creating institutionally specific corridors according to each institution's proportion of graduate and undergraduate enrolment before determining if an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** fall within the corridor. However, Council believes that it would be undesirable to have institutionally specific corridors determined on this basis.

Therefore, Council recommends that a single corridor be used for all enrolments. This provides for flexibility in shifting resources and is simpler.

Council recognizes that the width of corridor chosen is a critical component of its formula proposal. It must provide sufficient stability without providing an incentive to reduce enrolment and impede accessibility. Given that a substantial degree of dampening of enrolment fluctuations has been introduced by the 7-year moving-average, Council recommends that the corridor be set at **±3%** of an institution's **Base BIUs**.

(c) **Long-term Flexibility**

Council's third criterion - 'in the longer-term, funding should be flexible and allow for appropriate adjustments to changing levels of activity as well as allow for planning or co-ordinating activities' - is dealt with in two ways. First, when an institution's level of activity, as measured by its **Moving-average**

BIUs, drops below the floor of its corridor, the institution experiences a gradual reduction in funding commensurate with the reduction in **Moving-average BIUs** below its corridor floor. Second, if Council considers it appropriate, an institution will be able to negotiate for the establishment of a new level of **Base BIUs**, corridor, **Base BOI** and **Base Grants**. This will be possible if an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** are, or are planned to be, below its corridor and Council approves the change or, prior to going above its corridor, an institution's plans to do so are approved by Council. Council would recommend any agreed change to the Minister for final approval.

(i) Enrolment Sensitivity Below the Corridor

When an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** fall below its corridor floor, its funding is no longer insensitive to enrolment change. The institution's BOI is reduced from its **Base BOI** level by the gap between the institution's **Moving-average BIUs** and its corridor floor BIUs. This new level of BOI is defined as the institution's **Moving-average BOI**.[15] From this, the institution's **Moving-average Grants** are calculated by subtracting from its **Moving-average BOI** the institution's **Moving-average Formula Fees** adjusted for the 3% cushion provided by the corridor floor.[16] This allows for a smooth transition from funding within the corridor to funding below the floor. Funding is continuous below the corridor floor.

---

[15] More specifically, when:

$\text{Moving-average BIUs} < 0.97\ \text{Base BIUs}$, then:

$$\text{BOI} = \text{Moving-average BOI}$$

$$= \text{Base BOI} \times \left(\frac{\text{Moving-average BIUs} + 0.03\ \text{Base BIUs}}{\text{Base BIUs}}\right)$$

[16] More Specifically, when:

$\text{Moving-average BIUs} < 0.97\ \text{Base BIUs}$, then:

$$\text{Eligible Grants} = \text{Moving-average Grants}$$

$$= \text{Moving-average BOI} - (\text{Moving-average Formula Fees} + 0.03\ \text{Base Formula Fees})$$

When **Moving-average BIUs** drop below the floor, funding associated with such drops in enrolment is not discounted.

Council explored alternative enrolment dampening approaches and found them lacking. For example, a 3-year moving-average with a 50% discount on any enrolment decline was examined. Under this approach the BIUs found in a particular year would have an impact of approximately 16% in a given year of funding (the 7-year undiscounted moving-average gives an impact of approximately 14% each year). However, in the view of Council, the introduction of discounting impedes long-term flexibility and responsiveness of the formula to long-term changes in levels of activity. To take an extreme example, under a 50% discounting approach an institution could stop taking enrolment and receive 50% of its base funding. Council believes that, given sufficient time, and, if necessary, some bridge funding, an institution should be able to adjust to a lower level of funding which is reflective of the reduction in the level of activity undertaken by the institution. The 7-year moving-average chosen by Council provides sufficient time to make the appropriate adjustments in expenditures. Program adjustment funding may be available to provide bridge funding for institutions to adjust their resources to their new level of activity.

When an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** go above its corridor the institution's **Eligible Grants** are its **Base Grants**. It receives no automatic increase in BOI or formula grants. In effect the 100% funding discount found within the corridor extends above the corridor. This does not allow for long-term adjustment to changes in level of activity for institutions increasing their level of activity. This is deliberate. If funding were to become sensitive to enrolment above the corridor, the problems incurred in recent years with the dilution of the BIU value, as institutions are driven to grow in order to maintain their share of constrained funding, would continue. Council strongly believes that in a time of constrained funding an allocative mechanism which allows further erosion in the level of funding per BIU is counter to Council's major objective of enhanced funding stability.

Concern has been expressed to Council about the impact of the change in secondary school curriculum, Ontario Schools: Intermediate and Senior (OS:IS), on university enrolment levels in the late 1980's and early 1990's.

There continues to be a great deal of uncertainty as to future size or existence of a temporary double cohort of secondary school graduates (an OS:IS bulge) which will have to be accommodated by Ontario universities.

Council believes that, if any significant bulge in enrolment occurs, it should be dealt with separately with additional funding. Under this approach it would not be appropriate to include these enrolments in an institution's **Moving-average BIUs**. While such an enrolment increase would not bring about any additional incremental formula grant income through the proposed formula grants mechanism, it could provide an inappropriate degree of buffering after the bulge has worked its way through and enrolment declines. In the context of this formula proposal the inclusion of this enrolment in an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** would, in effect, provide a double-counting of this enrolment (special separate funding at the time these students were enrolled plus extraordinary formula grants buffering in the subsequent seven years). Thus, Council recommends that, if special funding for the OS:IS bulge is provided, each institution's **Moving-average BIUs** should be capped at its corridor ceiling for the years in question.

Several institutions have expressed concern that a significant decline in enrolment demand could have a destabilizing impact on institutional funding under the proposed mechanism. They project that, as a result of changing demographic patterns, enrolment will decline significantly during the early to mid 1990's. The corridor mechanism provides an incentive for institutions to maintain current levels of enrolment. However, under conditions of a reduction in total system demand, institutions which can maintain enrolment may be inclined to do so in order to stay within their corridor even if they feel it is more appropriate to reduce enrolment. This would cause an even more precipitous decline in demand for other institutions. It has been suggested that **Base BIUs** and the accompanying corridors be adjusted in line with total system enrolment decline to reduce the likelihood of aggressive competition for enrolment among institutions.

Council shares these concerns about the impact of a significant decline in enrolment demand on institutional behavior and funding stability. If system-wide demand were to fall significantly below the current level, then Council would recommend whatever adjustments are necessary to institutional **Base BIU** totals and to corridors. Council believes that it would be premature to set up a detailed mechanism at this time when it is projected that these problems will not occur for several years.

(ii) Negotiated Changes to an Institution's Base

Council recommends that under certain circumstances an institution be able to negotiate with Council a change in its **Base BIUs**, corridor, **Base BOI** and **Base Grants**. This should be allowed under the following circumstances. First, if an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** are, or are planned to be, below its corridor it will be able to approach Council to negotiate a change in its Base factors and corridor to an appropriate level below its current corridor. Second, if it has approached Council **prior to** going above its corridor, an institution may negotiate a change in its Base factors and corridor to an appropriate level above its current corridor. In all cases, institutions will be required to submit a specific institutional plan. If Council considers that a change is appropriate, a new level of Base factors and corridor, based upon an agreed plan, would be recommended to the Minister for approval. Council would have responsibility to ensure that changes occur in a co-ordinated manner reflecting system-level needs.

Council recognizes that the relative level of activity found in the three years chosen as base years is not likely to reflect each institution's long-term level of activity or an equilibrium position. Therefore, it sees a need to be able to redefine an institution's **Base BIUs**, corridors, **Base BOI** and **Base Grants**. This should be done in a systematic and planned manner. It would, for example, be inappropriate to fund increasing levels of enrolment in one institution when capacity exists at another accessible institution. On the other hand, there may be a need to expand enrolment in certain programs at particular institutions, placing the institution's long-term enrolment level beyond its current corridor. It would be appropriate to adjust this institution's **Base BIUs**, corridor, **Base BOI** and **Base Grants** to reflect this change. Similarly, either by design or circumstances, an institution may find its **Moving-average BIUs** falling to a new level below its corridor. It would be appropriate for that institution to negotiate an adjustment to its Base factors to reflect this change and avail itself of the funding stability inherent in a new corridor.

(d) Final Grant Calculation

As noted above, an institution's funding level is a function of whether its **Moving-average BIUs** are above or below its corridor floor. If the **Moving-average BIUs** are above the floor, the institution is funded according to its **Base BOI**; if an institution is below the floor, the institution is funded according to its **Moving-average BOI**. When all institutions' **Moving-average BIUs** are above their respective floor levels, then formula grants are allocated according to **Base BOI** and equal **Base Grants**. When, however, institutions are below their floor, all the formula grants are not allocated. Some grants are left over. Another step is needed to insure that all the formula grants available are allocated. This is accomplished by dividing the residual formula grants in proportion to each institution's **Eligible Grants**.

(i) Eligible Grants

The determination of **Eligible Grants** is an intermediate step in making the final formula grants allocation. Each institution's **Eligible Grants** determine its share of the total formula grants allocation. As noted above:

(a) if an institution's **Moving-average BIUs** are greater than or equal to 97% of its **Base BIUs**, its **Eligible Grants** are its **Base Grants**;

(b) if an institution's **Moving-verage BIUs** are less than 97% of its **Base BIUs**, its **Eligible Grants** are its **Moving-average Grants**.

(ii) Final Grants

The final formula grants entitlement for each institution is determined by dividing total formula grants available according to each institution's share of total **Eligible Grants**. Some institutions have suggested that instead of automatically distributing the residual grants, these funds should be allocated on a more discretionary basis through either the program adjustment fund or the enrolment/accessibility fund. It has been suggested that institutions in a position to attract more enrolment might increase intake in order to drive other institutions below their corridor to free-up additional formula grants. Council does not share this concern. If such predatory behavior were to occur in the future, Council would recommend appropriate action.

D. Extra-Formula Grants

The Minister announced on November 3, 1986, that $60 million of the $1,442.5 million in base operating grants for 1987-88 will be provided to address a number of specific needs identified by Council and individual institutions:

- $50 million to enhance quality and accessibility and the capacity and capability of the universities to conduct research that will contribute significantly to Ontario's economic growth. This acknowledges the fact that universities appreciably expanded their instructional and research activities with inadequate incremental base funding.

- $3 million in special grants to northern institutions to address particular needs in providing university level studies. This is in addition to the $5 million Northern Ontario Distance Education Access Network and the steps which the government has taken to improve the capacity and capability of Lakehead and Laurentian Universities in the forestry and mining sectors.

  These grants will supplement the existing Northern Grants program, and the Northern Distance Allowance program.

- $7.0 million to assist in meeting the costs associated with program closure, program start-up in areas of critical need, moving capacity from one institution to another or initiating cooperative efforts or joint programs in order to facilitate desired program adjustments. These programs will be folded into basic funding as appropriate

> over a reasonable period of time.[17]

Council applauds Government's initiative in providing additional on-going funding to the university system to meet some of the most pressing needs of these institutions. For 1987-88, Council recommends that four new extra-formula grant categories be set up to allocate these funds: enrolment/accessibility adjustments envelope; research overheads/infrastructure envelope; Northern mission grants; and program adjustments envelope. In addition to these new grant categories which are to be funded with "new" monies, Council is setting-up a temporary category of extra-formula grants from existing funding for institutional weight adjustments for Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and the Ontario College of Art.

A $50 million fund, noted above, was provided in recognition of expanded instructional and research activity. Several institutions alluded to these problems in their submissions to Council.

> Universities in Ontario are suffering from two conspicuously acute problems--high enrolment levels and intense research activity--both of which prejudice undergraduate instruction. But both reflect deliberate decisions made by universities acting to discharge their responsibilities in the public interest.
>
> In the late 1970's and the early 1980's, increases in freshman intake and undergraduate enrolment were taken at some universities in full knowledge that government policies would produce only modest increases in revenue. These responses were to both what was perceived as a need to increase the scale of operations and revenues, however disadvantageously, at those universities and to respond to a recognized social need for accessibility. The process, however, resulted in seriously reduced average revenue per student.
>
> Another group of universities were increasing their commitments to research in roughly the same years, similarly aware of prevailing public interest, even though there was no support for the costs of the

---

17. Letter from the Honourable G. Sorbara to Mrs. M. Paikin, November 3, 1986, p. 3.

> infrastructure needed to support research. This increase in university research efforts also tended to prejudice undergraduate instruction.
>
> In contemplating a recalibration of the formula or the provision of a new start, it is obvious that both problems have to be addressed.[18]

Council has given careful consideration to the division between these two needs. In assessing the appropriate split between the enrolment/accessibility adjustments envelope and the research overheads/-infrastructure funding envelope, Council has taken into account comments made by institutions along with various estimates of the scope of the problems to be addressed by each of these funds. There are several ways of assessing the size of each of these funding problems, each of which provides a different estimate of the funds required. In Council's view, the sizes of these funding problems and range of estimates for each problem are similar. At a system level, Council could not identify a significant difference in the magnitude of the funding problems associated with expanded instructional activity and expanded research activity. Rather, the difference occurred among institutions.

In evaluating these estimates, Council recognizes that the funding problems associated with enrolment growth and research overheads are similar in nature but not equivalent. For example, research overhead funding is needed to recognize that there has been a significant shortfall in funding for this purpose over and above the general operating grants shortfall. On the other hand,

---

[18] McMaster University, Submission on Revision of the Funding Formula, October 22, 1986, p. 1; Queens's University, Submission regarding Formula Revision, October 23, 1986, p. 1; University of Toronto, Submission to the Ontario Council of (sic) University Affairs in regard to "Allocation Mechanisms"--Second Stage of Consultation, October 22, 1986, p. 1; University of Waterloo, Submission to the Ontario Council of (sic) University Affairs in Regard to "Allocation Mechanisms"--Second Stage of Consultation, October 24, 1986, p. 1; The University of Western Ontario, Submission to the Ontario Council of (sic) University Affairs in Regard to "Allocation Mechanisms", October 22, 1986, p. 1.

Council views the special funding for enrolment primarily as correcting for a distributional problem associated with the current formula and its recognition of recent enrolment growth.

The funds for enrolment/accessibility and research overheads/infrastructure should not be used for addressing the general shortfall in formula grants funding.

With these considerations in mind, Council recommends that $25 million be allocated for enrolment/accessibility adjustments and $25 million be allocated for research overhead/infrastructure funding. This division reflects Council's conclusion that the magnitude of each of these funding problems is roughly equivalent.

1. Enrolment/Accessibility Adjustments Envelope

Council received several submissions which indicated that recent enrolment growth had not been sufficiently recognized in formula grants allocation. It was pointed out that the discounting of enrolment growth which has occurred for several years has affected institutions differentially, resulting in a much lower level of funding per BIU for several "younger" institutions.

Council has reviewed the concerns raised in these submissions and finds that there is a need for adjustment to recognize the problems associated with highly discounted enrolment growth. In determining the appropriate level of adjustment, Council identified two objectives it wished to achieve with this envelope. Its first objective is to supplement the current level of formula grant income for particular institutions to ensure that all institutions have an appropriate "starting-point" under the proposed formula grants mechanism. The second objective is to recognize the funding impact of discounting on all institutions whose instructional activity grew in recent years beyond the level recognized by the current formula.

Appropriate Starting-Point

Council believes that this envelope plays a critical role in establishing an appropriate level of base funding for each institution under the proposed operating grants formula. Under this new formula, base funding has a sustained and long-term impact on an institution's future level of funding. Therefore, it is imperative that there be an appropriate starting-point for base funding.

As outlined above, base factors reflect recent levels of activity (**Base BIUs** and **Base Formula Fees**) and recent levels of funding (**Base BOI** and **Base Grants**). However, because of the discounting in the present formula, current levels of formula grants do not appropriately reflect current levels of activity. In determining what adjustments must be made to base funding, Council has had to define an appropriate starting-point mindful of several factors.

When Council introduced discounting into the formula in the 1970's, it did so in the context of a projected decline in enrolment demand beginning in the early 1980's. This did not materialize, and indeed demand has grown significantly since then. Discounting was introduced in a time of growth, in part anticipating that, in a few years' time, institutions would require their funding to be buffered from expected enrolment declines. It is now clear that the forecasted decline in enrolment did not materialize. At the same time, Government's policy of accessibility remained unchanged.

However, Council also recognizes the importance of two other factors. For much of the growth undertaken since the late 1970's, the direction towards increased discounting was clear. Institutions accepted increased enrolment with the knowledge that they would receive only partial funding recognition. In addition, Council believes that, for some of this enrolment growth, partial funding recognition is entirely appropriate because institutions incurred only marginal increases in cost.

Given these considerations, Council believes that, when assessing the appropriate starting point, a balance must be struck between recognizing the enrolment growth that has occurred and the context in which it has occurred.

In operational terms, full recognition of recent enrolment growth (exclusive of the shortfall in operating grants funding) would be to use adjustment funds to bring enrolment growth institutions' formula grants up to the point where their **Base BOI** per **Base BIU** equals the system average. However, given the context in which recent enrolment growth occurred and the notion of marginal costs, full recognition would provide an inappropriate starting-point for base funding under the proposed operating grants formula. It is Council's judgment that an appropriate starting point is an allocation mechanism which produces values of **Base** BOI per **Base** BIU, within a narrower range, with no institution greater than about 6 or 7 percent below the system-average. Given the funds available to achieve this objective, greater recognition must be accorded institutions for which recent enrolment constitutes a larger share of their total enrolment.

General Enrolment Growth

Council recognizes that discounting has affected all institutions that grew in recent years and not just those whose **Base** BOI per **Base** BIU is low. All institutions, except Algoma, Hearst and Dominican, have experienced discounted enrolment growth in recent years beyond the level fully recognized by the current formula. By virtue of the discounting and averaging provisions in the current formula, these institutions' fully funded BIUs are less than their current BIU levels. This is a logical outcome of a discounted allocation formula in a time of expansion in activity. Institutions receive only marginal funding recognition for enrolment growth.

In Council's view, in and of itself, marginal funding for enrolment growth is highly appropriate. Given the strong indications of continued discounting provided in recent years, institutions should have expected to receive only incremental funding for additional enrolment.

However, Council believes that the constrained funding experienced for several years provided inadequate recognition of this increase in instructional activity. Therefore, as a second objective of this enrolment/accessibility adjustments envelope, Council provides some recognition for all institutions' marginal growth BIUs.

Distribution

Council's objectives for this fund are two-fold. The first objective, providing an appropriate starting point for **Base** BIUs, calls for a weighting of the funds available towards those institutions whose recent enrolment growth constitutes a larger share of their total enrolment in order to reduce the gap in **Base** BOI funding per **Base** BIU. The second objective, recognizing inadequate incremental funding for all growth institutions, calls for proportional funding for all growth BIUs.

Council recommends that, in 1987-88, the $25 million in enrolment/accessibility adjustments be allocated in the following manner to recognize both of Council's objectives:

(i) $12.5 million to be allocated according to each institution's proportion of weighted Growth BIUs. Growth BIUs are defined as the gap between an institution's undiscounted and discounted BIUs and are calculated by subtracting each institution's 1986-87 Funding BIUs (i.e., discounted BIUs) from the average of its 1983-84, 1984-85 and 1985-86 BIUs (i.e., undiscounted BIUs). Each institution's Growth BIUs are weighted according to its proportion of undiscounted BIUs (the 3-year average indicated above).[19]

(ii) $12.5 million to be allocated according to each institution's proportion of the university system's unweighted Growth BIUs.

In Council's view, such an allocation provides an appropriate balance between its two objectives for this fund and meets the criterion of a minimum level of funding of 93% to 94% of the current level of system **Base** BOI per **Base** BIU for all institutions.

Council recommends that in 1988-89, these grants be included in each institution's **Base Grants** and **Base** BOI.

On-Going Envelope

Council believes there is merit in having in place an on-going mechanism to respond to accessibility problems in the future. Although it has not been able to develop

---

[19] More specifically:

$$\text{Weighted Growth BIUs} = \text{Growth BIUs} \times \left(\frac{\text{Growth BIUs}}{\text{Base BIUs}}\right)$$

this mechanism sufficiently to make a proposal at this time, it is prepared to follow-up with further initiatives in 1987. If the up-coming OS:IS bulge is significant, it will be important to have such a mechanism in place. Council envisions the enrolment/accessibility adjustments envelope remaining in place for 1988-89 and beyond. However, this envelope will only allocate funds when the need arises as in the case of an OS:IS bulge. In other years this envelope will remain inactive.

2. Research Overheads/Infrastructure Funding Envelope

Several institutions expressed concern about the level of funding provided for the overhead costs of sponsored research through the current formula grants funding. It was pointed out that sponsored research activity and direct funding have been significantly expanded in recent years. During this time, the support of the indirect or overhead costs of this research through operating grants has not kept pace. This has had a particularly negative impact on the research infrastructure and other areas of university operations at institutions heavily involved in resource-intensive research. Council has reviewed the concerns raised in these submissions and concurs that there is a need to provide special funding to recognize these costs.

Subsequently, some suggested that the funds should support new research initiatives. Others suggested that special consideration should be given to "smaller" or "younger" institutions which are not currently engaged in resource-intensive research. In Council's view, Government's establishment of the Technology Fund and the revitalization of the University Research Incentive Fund are intended to address new socially and economically important research initiatives. However, Council believes that the intentions of the research overheads/infrastructure funding envelope should not be altered from what Council indicated in its funding advice and what the Minister indicated in his letter of November 3, 1986, in response. These funds should be used to address inadequacies of support for the indirect or overhead costs of existing research. Council concurs that there is a need to provide special funding to recognize these costs.

Therefore, $25 million has been allocated towards covering extraordinary shortfall in the funding of the overhead costs of sponsored research. The $25 million made available provides only partial recognition of shortfall in the funding of research overheads. Council believes that, much like the situation outlined above concerning enrolment growth, institutions that took additional sponsored research did so in full knowledge of the inadequate funding of overhead costs associated with that research. It is clear that these institutions have made research a high priority in their institutions and have allocated resources accordingly.

Unlike the enrolment/accessibility adjustments funding, Council feels that research overhead/-infrastructure funding should be provided within a separate envelope on an on-going basis. Research infrastructure and overhead funding is currently funded through the formula grants envelope. The bulk of this funding will continue to be provided through this mechanism. The additional envelope must be considered to be a marginal funding source for research activity. As such, it should be responsive to changes in the level of sponsored research activity at each university and should reflect the relative levels of costs incurred at each institution.

Council proposes that this fund be allocated on the basis of peer-adjudicated research which does not have overhead funding attached to it. In taking this position, it reaffirms Council's position that, for contract research, institutions should be expected to negotiate overhead coverage before taking on the research. If institutions do not demand overhead coverage for contract research, they should not expect Government to cover the university's costs. Furthermore, it would be folly for Government to allocate these research funds on the basis of contract research, since it would undermine a university's position in trying to secure overhead funding for contracts if the contractor felt there would be Government recognition of these overhead costs. In fact, Government's policy on Government research contracts with universities is that the:

> ...terms of these contracts shall cover the full cost of the research, including appropriate allowances for indirect and overhead costs.[20]

---

20. Management Board Policy Statement, *Purchase and Management of Professional Services*, Research and Development Services, April 1, 1986, 50-9-1.

This principle should apply to all university research contracts.

For the first year of the new envelope, 1987-88, Council recommends that the $25 million be allocated according to each institution's proportion of peer-adjudicated sponsored research funding by the Federal Government's three granting agencies (SSHRC, NSERC and MRC) for the years 1983-84, 1984-85 and 1985-86. This is the same allocative approach recommended by both Council and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) for the Research Leadership Fund. Council recognizes that there may be other sources of peer-adjudicated funding which should be included or that a better approach to identifying the unfunded overhead costs of peer-adjudicated research could be developed. Council is proposing, therefore, that after appropriate consultation, Council review this allocation in the upcoming year before recommending a permanent allocative mechanism for this envelope. At the present time, Council sees this on-going allocation being adjusted triennially to reflect changes in the distribution of research overhead costs.

3. Mission-Related Institution-Specific Funding Envelope

Four extra-formula grant categories have been designated for dealing with institutionally-specific funding needs: institutional weights, Northern mission, differentiation grants, and bilingualism grants. Some institutions have suggested that there should also be special funding recognition for small institutions. Council considered the arguments put forward for small institution funding, but feels that these concerns are appropriately dealt with through the stability mechanisms found in the new formula grants envelope and through mission-related funding envelopes such as Northern grants and differentiation grants.

(a) Institutional Weights

Council recommends an increase in the institutional weights and a phased-in increase in the formula fees for both Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and the Ontario College of Art (OCA).

(i) Ryerson Polytechnical Institute

Ryerson's programs are currently being funded on the basis of an institutional formula weight of 1.34 applicable to the base years (1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76) and 1.36 applicable to the moving average years. These weights were assigned to Ryerson as a result of Council's recommendations in Advisory Memoranda 79-V and 81-VI.

On March 14, 1986, Ryerson submitted to Council a proposal to increase its institutional BIU weight and formula fee rate. In that submission, Ryerson proposed a change from the approach which had led to Council's previous recommendations, indicating that the premise that a distinction existed between the costs associated with degree and diploma programs was no longer valid. Ryerson stated:

> To the extent that our program costing methodology is able to pick up the significant differentiated cost factors of programs, the cost data available on Ryerson programs indicate that program costs are dependent largely upon underlying curricular needs and program structure, not upon whether a program is a diploma or degree. For example, theatre, exclusively a diploma program, is one of the higher cost programs together with Interior Design which is a four-year degree program.[21]

Council accepts Ryerson's argument regarding program costs associated with degree and diploma programs, but believes that program costs alone are not an appropriate basis for determining an institution's income since costs are also influenced by institutional choices.

Ryerson suggests that, for its funding to be equitably based, there should be a degree of comparability between the level of funding for Ryerson and the funding received by universities offering related undergraduate polytechnic programs. Ryerson's comparison of "university-equivalent" weights for its programs resulted in a formula weight proposal of 1.65. However, in keeping with Advisory Memorandum 79-V which indicated that Ryerson is funded essentially for instructional activities and not for research, Ryerson applied a research discount of 10%, resulting in a requested weight of 1.49.

---

[21] Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, A Proposal to Adjust Ryerson's Formula Weight and Formula Fee, March 14, 1986, p.9.

Council accepts Ryerson's argument of comparability to university polytechnic programs but, after careful analysis, concludes that the appropriate "university-equivalent" weight should be 1.58, to which a 10% research discount should be applied. Therefore, Council recommends that Ryerson's institutional weight be increased from the current level of 1.36 to 1.42.

On February 18, 1982, the Minister of Colleges and Universities indicated that:

> ...beginning in 1983/84 I will introduce special increases in formula fees for Ryerson and OCA with a view to making them more appropriate to the level of education and benefit derived by the students.[22]

This change in fee rate was halted by the introduction of the Inflation Restraint Program. The Minister, in a letter dated November 3, 1986, requested that:

> ...council advise as to whether the government should recommence a phased-in increase in formula fees at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and the Ontario College of Art to bring these fees in line with those of the other institutions in this sector.[23]

Ryerson's submission recommends a formula fee adjustment to $1,020 (a "university-equivalent" formula fee of $1,130 discounted by the 10%). Council accepts the appropriateness of the increase proposed but not the rationale for the discount, believing instead that Ryerson's formula fees should be "in line with those of the other institutions in this sector". Therefore, Council recommends that the formula fee rate for Ryerson be increased from its current level to the "Group 5" level outlined in the Operating Formula Manual. This group includes arts and science and most other undergraduate program areas.

---

[22] Letter from the Honourable Dr. B. Stephenson to Dr. W.C. Winegard, February 18, 1982.

[23] Letter from the Honourable G. Sorbara to Mrs. M. Paikin, November 3, 1986, p. 3.

Eventually, Ryerson's **Base BOI** will be increased by the percentage increase in its institutional weight (4.4%) with the entire increase being funded by increased formula fee revenue. However, Council believes that it is neither feasible nor desirable to introduce a fee increase of the magnitude indicated in one year. Consequently, it recommends phasing-in the fee rate increase as well as the increase in **Base BOI** and **Base Formula Fees** in the formula grants envelope over a three-year period, beginning in 1987-88. The formula fee increase should be phased in on the basis of 1/3 of the increase in the first year, 1/2 the remaining balance of the increase in the second year, and the remaining balance of the increase in the third year. In the first year of the phased-in fee increase, much of the impact on students will be offset by the changes in policy on compulsory ancillary fees announced earlier by the Minister.

Council believes that the funding impact of the change in weight should be felt in 1987-88. Therefore, for 1987-88, a separate Institutional Weights Adjustment envelope has been created to provide the residual funding required by the weight change. If the first year of the 3-year phase-in of the Ryerson formula fee rate increase takes place in 1987-88, Council's preliminary estimate of the grant amount required by Ryerson next year is approximately $1.7 million. If the fee rate increase is delayed, then approximately $3.0 million in grants will be required by Ryerson. It is anticipated that this extra-formula grant will be phased out in the second year of the phase-in of the formula fee rate increase.

(ii) Ontario College of Art

OCA's programs are currently being funded on the basis of an institutional formula weight of 1.3 on the base years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77. These weights were assigned to OCA as a result of Council's recommendations in Advisory Memorandum 75-VII.

On October 20, 1986, OCA requested that Council consider a proposal to increase its institutional BIU weight and formula fee rate. The submission has been reviewed and Council feels that some adjustment to the OCA weight and formula fee rate is warranted. OCA has requested that:

Council review two anomalies in relation to the Formula Grant Funding as it pertains to OCA. The two anomalies involved are:

1. The base years used in the calculation of the formula funding.

2. The BIU programme weight (and formula fees) used for OCA programmes.[24]

In light of the new allocative mechanism being recommended, the request for a change to OCA's base years is no longer relevant.

On the matter of program weights, after analysis of the submission, Council accepts OCA's recommendation of 1.5 as the appropriate weight for OCA programs in relation to comparable university programs. However, Council does not accept OCA's recommendation of a 7% research discount. Instead, this weight should be reduced by the same 10% research discount applied in Ryerson's case, which results in a recommendation that OCA's institutional weight be 1.35.

OCA's submission recommends a formula fee adjustment to $1,069 ($1,149 for 1986-87 less a research discount). Council accepts the appropriateness of the increase proposed but not the discount, believing instead that, like Ryerson, OCA's formula fees should be "in line with those of the other institutions in this sector". Therefore, Council recommends that the formula fee rate for OCA should be increased from its current level to the "Group 5" level outlined in the Operating Formula Manual. This group includes fine and applied arts programs.

Similar to the treatment given to Ryerson, as indicated above, OCA's Base BOI will eventually be increased by the percentage increase in its institutional weight (3.8%). Council feels that its formula fee rate increase should be phased in, in a similar manner to that proposed for Ryerson, over 3 years beginning in 1987-88. Consequently, in order to recognize fully the impact of the institutional weight change, approximately $0.24 million in grant must be made available if the fee rate is increased as suggested. Approximately $0.38 million will be required by OCA if the fee rate increase is delayed. It is anticipated that this extra-formula grant will be phased out in the third year of the phase-in of the formula fee rate increase. The formula fee increase should be phased-in on the basis of 1/3 of the increase in the first year, 1/2 the remaining balance of the increase in the second year, and the balance of the increase in the third year.

---

[24] Ontario College of Art, A Proposal to Adjust the Formula Funding as It applies to the Ontario College of Art, November 1986, p.21.

(b) Northern Mission

Council believes that for 1987-88, the current Northern grants should be allocated in the usual fashion. At this time, Council reserves decision on the distribution of the new "$3 million in special grants to northern institutions to address particular needs in providing university level studies" until such time it has been able to give this matter appropriate consideration. However, Council undertakes to fulfill the commitment made in Advisory Memorandum 82-XIV and review the Northern grants allocation. This review should be undertaken in 1987 with the objective of identifying the special mission-related costs of Northern institutions.

(c) Other Extra-Formula Grants

Council has dealt with neither differentiation grants nor bilingualism grants in this formula revision. These categories of grants remain unchanged.

4. Program Adjustments Envelope

A key component of Council's new approach to operating grants allocation is the program adjustment grants envelope. Government has allocated $7 million for this fund for 1987-88. Council outlines in Advisory Memorandum 86-II the basic character of this envelope:

> Council foresees a need to fund a portion of the costs associated with program closure, program start-up in areas of critical need, moving capacity from one institution to another or initiating co-operative efforts or joint programs in order to facilitate desired program adjustments. The length

> of commitment should vary from short-term for program closings to more long-term for program openings. Funding for program closures, capacity shifts and joint programs is, in effect, an incentive system to provide more focus for the university enterprise in Ontario. Funding for program start-up in areas of critical need identified by Government or Council is an incentive program for new initiatives. However, in each case a multi-year commitment must be made to phase-in the changes anticipated. Carry-over funding similar to that provided for capital grants should be instituted. Under this arrangement a commitment should be made to fund a particular program adjustment over a period of time and the flow of funds should be identified. Funding recommendations would be on a "new start" basis similar to Council's current approach to capital funding.
>
> Council believes the best way to fund these program adjustments is through a challenge fund. Under such an arrangement, institutions will be able to make proposals for program adjustments and negotiate funding for them. Council and the Minister should also be able to use these funds to provide incentives for program consolidation and specialization as well as new program areas.[25]

To date, Council has not developed criteria and guidelines for this fund. Before doing so, it would like to receive input on the character, process and criteria of this fund from COU and individual institutions. Council's first inclination is that such criteria should be relatively flexible to accommodate the broadest spectrum of program adjustments and specialization possible. It would like this input by March, 1987.

The approach proposed by Council places some pressure on all parties involved to develop an efficient and timely process for dealing with program adjustment proposals. However, Council is also mindful of the need for adequate development of the program before allocating funds. Demonstration of the merit of such funding will be of greater importance than a quick response in the flowing of funds. For the first year of the program, Council proposes that the allocation of these funds be made once the appropriate process has been worked out and institutions have had sufficient time to make submissions. Council should not attempt to recommend an allocation at the time it submits its allocative advice in January or February of next year. This recommendation should be made later in the year after appropriate consultation and development of the program has taken place.

---

[25] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Advisory Memorandum 86-II - Government Support of the University System in 1987-88 and 1988-89, June 1986, pp. 22-23.

In future years, the process should be well enough established to allow for a more timely allocation of funds.

Summary

Council's proposed revisions to the operating grants formula and extra-formula grants allocations provide Government with an appropriate system of mechanisms for achieving the objectives outlined earlier in this memorandum. In the short-term, the new formula provides funding stability by preventing extreme fluctuations in an institution's income. This is accomplished by removing the effects of enrolment change on funding within specified limits. The new approach also provides enhanced funding predictability since an institution will now need to project only the global funding increase and its own enrolment. Since each institution's formula grants are a function of its own Base factors, institutions will not need to project the enrolment of other institutions, as is now the case, in order to predict their basic income level. The new formula retains, and indeed enhances in the longer-term, accountability to the public by linking funds to a quantifiable factor (i.e., **Base BIUs** or **Moving-Average BIUs**). The introduction of new extra-formula grants envelopes provides for a more equitable allocation of operating grants among institutions Council does acknowledge some measure of complexity during the initial years of the new allocative system with the application of the enrolment/accessibility adjustments and institutional weight changes. Council believes that, thereafter, the modified operating grants allocative system will be simple to use, understandable and practical to implement.

Finally, Council believes strongly that the proposed operating grants system provides a new opportunity for

Government, institutions, both individually and collectively, and Council to plan and implement the changes in academic programs and enrolment that are deemed necessary and desirable in order to ensure that the system as a whole maintains an optimum breadth of programs and quality of education given the funds available.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-23

DISTRIBUTION MECHANISM WITH RESPECT TO FORMULA GRANTS, FORMULA FEES AND EXTRA-FORMULA GRANTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE FUNDING YEAR 1987-88.

THAT, in accordance with the considerations in this memorandum, appropriate modifications to the operating grants allocative formula, formula fees, and calculations of extra-formula grants be implemented for 1987-88.

Accountability

Each of the envelopes receiving "new" monies has been set up with a specific purpose in mind. Council believes that it is important for universities to demonstrate to Government that these funds have been put towards these purposes and will further Government's objectives. To assure Government that these new funds have been spent effectively, Council suggests that, for 1987-88, institutions be required to submit to the Minister an accounting of how funds provided for enrolment/accessibility adjustments, research overheads/infrastructure funding, special Northern projects funding, and program adjustments are expended.

Conclusion

Council has proposed a significant change to operating grants allocation. It views its proposal as an integrated package of funding initiatives. Some areas of this package have been developed in detail. This involved extensive consultations with the institutions, including numerous opportunities for written submissions from individual institutions and a collective session with the Executive Heads at which they had the opportunity to respond to a draft proposal. Other areas require further consultation and development. Those areas identified for further work should be addressed in the up-coming months by Council, Government and the university system.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

December 12, 1986

86-VIII GRADUATE PROGRAM FUNDING

ACCOUNTING (MACC), UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO; CANADIAN HERITAGE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (MA), TRENT UNIVERSITY; COMPUTER SCIENCE (PHD), UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO; LEGAL TRANSLATION (GRADUATE DIPLOMA), UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Introduction

In this memorandum Council continues the practice of submitting annual advice on graduate program approvals as initiated in Advisory Memorandum 83-VIII.

Council offers advice on four new graduate programs. In addition, Council continues the practice of offering a recommended weight for each graduate level one program - it being understood that all graduate level two programs, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual, will be in Category 8, with a weight of 6, or 2 per term.

I. New Graduate Programs

Accounting (MAcc), University of Waterloo

Council has reviewed the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding Waterloo's new master's program in Accounting (see Appendix A) and is satisfied that the program meets the first four funding criteria.

Council accepts that there are strong arguments for a graduate program in accountancy which will provide the opportunity for greater specialization by accounting students and will respond to an increasing demand within the accounting profession for graduates with specialized research skills.

Of note is the significant increase in demand for graduate-level accounting skills by accounting firms. Although there has been an increase in the number of master's level accounting programs in the United States, Council notes that a similar increase has not yet occurred in Canada and that the Master of Accounting program at Waterloo will be the first to be offered in Ontario.

Council believes the Master of Accounting program at the University of Waterloo may also encourage Canadian accounting students to continue their studies at the doctoral level, thereby helping to ease the severe shortage of academic accountants which underlies the current dearth of graduate level accounting programs and the shortage of accountants with research capabilities or interests. Council notes that the shortage of accounting academics in Canada is projected to worsen.

The significant encouragement which this program received from the Canadian accounting profession, the University of Waterloo and the evidence of strong student interest indicates to Council that the funding of this program, even in a time of economic constraint, is both appropriate and timely.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-24 **FUNDING FOR THE MASTER'S PROGRAM IN ACCOUNTING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO FOR 1988-89.**

THAT, the MAcc program in Accounting at the University of Waterloo be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89, and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving-average for the university - the program to be in Category 6 with a weight of 3, or 1 per term, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

Canadian Heritage and Development Studies (MA), Trent University

Council has reviewed the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding Trent's new master's program in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies (see Appendix B) and is satisfied that the program meets the first four funding criteria.

Council accepts the evidence contained in letters provided by Trent which indicate a societal need for graduates with an academic background involving the multidisciplinary study of regional, native, environmental and heritage issues. Correspondants indicate that graduates with a multidisciplinary background dealing with the complex political, environmental and social issues related to Canadian heritage and development would be attractive candidates for positions in the public sector which require research and analysis skills.

Council acknowledges that the multidisciplinary format of the program is unique and that it is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of Trent University and with the graduate role which Trent has adopted in consultation with Council. Council accepts the Academic Advisory Committee's position that it is extremely important that the multidisciplinary emphasis of the Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program be maintained, and that the program not evolve into three individual, interdisciplinary programs, since this development would be contrary to Trent's objectives in the graduate program area.

In light of the above, Council recommends that this program should be funded even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-25

FUNDING FOR THE MASTER'S PROGRAM IN CANADIAN HERITAGE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES AT TRENT UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89.

THAT, the multidisciplinary MA program in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies, at Trent University be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89, and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving-average for the university - the program to be in Category 6, with a weight of 3, or 1 per term, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

Computer Science (PhD), University of Western Ontario

Council has reviewed the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding Western's new doctoral program in Computer Science (see Appendix C) and is satisfied that the program meets the first four funding criteria.

Council accepts that the increasing demand for doctoral computer science graduates projected by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Snowbird Conference Reports and the Canadian Information Processing Society will not be met by the existing supply.

Although there are currently three comprehensive doctoral programs in computer science in Ontario, Council accepts the Academic Advisory Committee's judgement that the magnitude of the societal need for computer science PhD's is such that the creation of an additional program constitutes justifiable duplication of existing programs.

Council notes that the doctoral program at Western is complemented by well-established undergraduate and master's programs in computer science.

Given the demand for computer science doctoral graduates, Council recommends that this program be eligible for formula support, even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-26 **FUNDING FOR THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN COMPUTER SCIENCE FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the PhD program in Computer Science at the University of Western Ontario be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89, and that eligible enrolment from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving-average for the university.

Legal Translation (Graduate Diploma), University of Ottawa

Council has considered the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding Ottawa's new graduate diploma program in Legal Translation (see Appendix D) and is satisfied that the program meets the first four funding criteria.

Council notes that the purpose of this professionally-oriented program is to create graduates capable of translating a variety of legal texts from English into French. It is Council's understanding that there has been an enormous increase in the need for legal translation skills across Canada which has not been met by a similar increase in the number of legal translators. Council notes that the demand for legal translation skills is expected to increase on a longterm basis and that this program will be the first in Canada to combine the disciplines of law and translation in a professionally-oriented program for the purpose of providing students with legal translation skills.

Council considers significant the number and variety of organizations which support the establishment of this program, and which indicate an immediate need for program graduates. It is Council's understanding that student demand for the program is equally strong.

Council acknowledges that the diploma program at Ottawa is complemented by a well-established School of Translators and Interpretors, a Faculty of Law, an MA program in Translation and a Centre de traduction et de documentation located on campus.

As the University of Ottawa's Graduate Diploma program in Legal Translation is clearly unique and is meeting a need for legal translators which is Canada-wide, Council believes that the funding of this program, even in a time of economic constraint, is both appropriate and timely.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-27 **FUNDING FOR THE GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN LEGAL TRANSLATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation at the University of Ottawa be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89, and that eligible enrolment, from 1986-87 on, be included in the moving-average for the university - the program to be in Category 6, with a weight of 3, or 1 per term, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

II. Existing Graduate Programs

Council has reviewed the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies' annual report on Periodic Appraisal results and has no recommendations to make on existing graduate programs at this time. Council will continue to monitor the quality of, and the need for existing funded graduate programs, and will advise the Minister accordingly each year.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

January 30, 1987

Appendix A

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Master of Accounting (MAcc), University of Waterloo
New Graduate Program Considered for Formula Funding

On December 10, 1985, the University of Waterloo requested that Council consider its new Master of Accounting (MAcc) program for funding approval. Council, according to established procedures, referred the program to its Academic Advisory Committee. The Committee's findings with respect to the application of Council's funding criteria are summarized below.

1. Academic Appraisal

The Council of Ontario Universities has certified that this program has passed a rigorous academic appraisal (February 22, 1985), and, at the time of appraisal, did not require any improvements.

2. Need

The Committee acknowledges four factors identified by the University of Waterloo submission as evidence of the societal need for a Master of Accounting program. These factors are: an increasing demand within the accounting profession for accountants with specialized skills; a lack of specialized accounting programs in Ontario and Canada; an increasing demand for accountants with research capabilities; and, a severe shortage of academic accountants.

An increasing demand for accountants with specialized skills has been attributed to the growing complexity of the economic, financial and political environments in which accountants must operate. Rapid changes in technology, the economy and government legislation make it increasingly difficult for a chartered accountant to continue to be knowledgeable in all areas of service or practice. A recent study conducted by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) indicates that many members of the accounting profession are presently engaged in specialized practice. However, there is a need for continued improvement in the skills and competence of these members.[1]

The CICA report notes that:

> ...our profession has a responsibility to respond to change and the needs of the marketplace by organizing itself to offer a broad range of diversified services of a uniformly high quality.[2]

Meeting this responsibility seriously challenges the profession's ability to provide a growing range of high quality services.[3] The trend toward specialization is an attempt to fulfill this responsibility.

The trend toward specialization within the professional accounting firm is reflected in an increasing demand for accounting graduates with master's level training. Professional accounting firms are particularly interested in accounting graduates with specialized training in taxation, computer auditing, information systems, business valuation, insolvency, financial or managerial accounting. The Waterloo submission notes that chartered accounting firms worldwide are hiring an ever greater proportion of graduate level accounting students each year.[4]

The number of American master's level accounting programs has increased over 200%, from 32 to 102 programs, between 1970 and 1982.[5] Due to a shortage of Canadian graduate accounting programs, many Canadian firms have been hiring foreign graduates possessing master's level training or enrolling their employees in foreign graduate programs.[6] The Committee recognizes that there is little opportunity for Canadians to undertake in-depth graduate work in accounting within Canada. As indicated in the submission of the University of Waterloo:

---

[1] Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, *The Report of the Committee to Study Specialization in the Canadian Accountancy Profession*, December 1981, p.1 (Summary).

[2] *Ibid*., p.9.

[3] *Ibid*., p.9.

[4] University of Waterloo, *Request for Funding, Master of Accounting Program*, November, 1985, p.2.

[5] The Commission on Professional Accounting Education, *Postbaccalaureate Education Required for the CPA Profession*, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, July 1983, pp. 33-34.

> Most accounting education in Canadian universities is limited to a restricted number of undergraduate or MBA courses in financial and managerial accounting. In such programs little consideration is given to more advanced topics dealing with accounting theory, advanced applied problems, and accounting research or the problems that arise because of a rapidly changing computerized environment - all areas given emphasis by the University of Waterloo's Master of Accounting program.[7]

The Committee understands that individuals wishing to obtain a master's degree in accounting are restricted to two Canadian programs, offered at Laval University (French instruction) and the University of Saskatchewan, or programs in the United States.

The Committee accepts that the MAcc program at the University of Waterloo will contribute to the creation of a larger pool of Canadian accountants with specialized training, will reduce the need for Canadian firms to hire foreign graduates and will offer additional opportunities for Canadians seeking advanced accounting training.

There has also been a significant increase in the demand for accountants with research capabilities. This demand has resulted from an increase in the amount of accounting research occurring across the profession and a growing demand for Canadian-based research pertaining to the Canadian accounting profession. Information obtained from The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants indicates that their annual research expenditures have increased from $194,000 in 1970-71 to

---

[6] University of Waterloo, Request for Funding, Master of Accounting Program, November 13, 1985, p.2.

[7] Ibid., p.1.

$1,800,000 in 1980-81.[8] The Committee notes that the creation of a graduate level accounting program with a research component at the University of Waterloo will increase the opportunity for Ontario residents to engage in in-depth, research-oriented study. In addition, the program will meet a demand from major accounting firms and professional accounting organizations[9] for research-oriented accountants, employable in corporate education and research programs.

The Committee is aware that problems resulting from the current shortage of accounting programs and research-oriented accounting graduates with post-baccalaureate level training are compounded by a severe shortage of academic accountants. In 1979, a major study funded by the Canadian Academic Accounting Association confirmed that there were only 12 accounting PhD students in all of Canada that year and estimated that a maximum of three Canadian accounting PhD graduates could be produced each year.[10]

In 1982, a report published by the Committee of Vice-Presidents Academic of the Council of Ontario Universities emphasized the problems resulting from the small number of academic accountants. Their report stated that:

> ...the present shortcomings in university accounting education and the professional training for students planning to enter the profession of accounting are the direct result of the current excessive demand on educational resources relative

---

8. University of Waterloo, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, February 12, 1986, p. 2.

9. The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Society of Management Accountants of Canada, the Certified General Accountants Association of Canada, the Institute of Internal Auditors, and the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation are examples of professional accounting organizations that conduct accounting research and education programs.

10. Thomas H. Beechy, University Accounting Programs in Canada: Inventory and Analysis, The Canadian Academic Accounting Association, November 1980, pp. 153-54.

> to their availability... The underlying problem is the current grave shortage of academic accountants.[11]

A study conducted in 1986, for the Canadian Academic Accounting Association indicates that a shortage of accounting academics in Canada continues to exist and is predicted to worsen over the next five years.[12]

The Committee acknowledges the severe shortage of academic accountants in Canada and believes that the MAcc program at Waterloo would help direct students toward academic careers and increase the academic qualifications of individuals available for appointment as full-time accounting faculty. The University of Waterloo has indicated that, of the initial class of 11 students, two have gone on to do PhD work in accounting at American institutions and two others are teaching at the University of Waterloo on a part-time basis.

The Committee acknowledges an increasingly strong student demand for this program by qualified students. From a total of 20 applicants in 1985, 11 were enrolled and all graduated in 1986. From a pool of 40 applicants in 1986, 24 students were enrolled. Based on their experience to date, Waterloo expects demand for the program to continue meeting, or exceeding, original enrolment projections. The university predicts that the program may attract up to 50 students by 1991.

On the basis of evidence illustrating the need for specialized accounting training and research-oriented accountants, the lack of specialized accounting programs in Ontario and Canada, the shortage of academic accountants generally, and strong student demand for the program, the Committee believes that this program meets Council's criteria for societal need and student demand.

---

[11] The Study Group on Accounting, Committee of Vice-Presidents Academic, Council of Ontario Universities, A Report on Accounting Education in Ontario Universities, December 1982, p. 20.

[12] W.R. Scott, Report of Demand and Supply Survey of Canadian Ph.D.s in Accounting, The Canadian Academic Accounting Association, January 1986, pp. 16-17.

3. Uniqueness

The Master of Accounting program at Waterloo is the only graduate accounting program in Ontario and the only master of accounting program in Canada to give special attention to the application of computers to accounting. Only two other master's programs in accounting are available in Canada - at the University of Saskatchewan and Laval University.

The Committee is satisfied that this program meets Council's uniqueness criterion.

4. Aims, Objectives and Existing Strengths

The MAcc program at the University of Waterloo is complemented by a large undergraduate accounting program. Graduate courses in Computer Science, Management Sciences and the Faculty of Arts offer MAcc students an opportunity to broaden the scope of their accounting training through the selection of a wide variety of electives in related areas of study.

The Committee notes that the Waterloo MAcc program was developed with significant encouragement from all sectors of the accounting profession in Canada. An advisory council on accounting, created by the University of Waterloo and composed primarily of senior executives of accounting organizations and firms, government and industry, offered advice on the program's development. The Master of Accounting program will also benefit from the existence of a chair in accounting and finance, recently established at the university, which was funded through donations made to the entire accounting program totalling approximately one million dollars.

The Master of Accounting program is included in the University of Waterloo's five-year plan and is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the University.

5. Funding

The Committee, therefore, recommends to Council that:

the Master of Accounting program at the University of Waterloo be recommended by Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
June 17, 1986

Appendix B

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Master of Arts in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies (MA), Trent University
New Graduate Program Considered for Formula Funding

On August 15, 1985, Trent University requested that Council consider its new Master of Arts in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies (MA) for funding approval. Council, according to established procedures, referred the program to its Academic Advisory Committee. The Committee's findings with respect to the application of Council's funding criteria are summarized below.

1. Academic Appraisal

The Council of Ontario Universities has certified that this program has passed a rigorous academic appraisal (May 17, 1985) and, at the time of appraisal, did not require any improvements.

2. Need

In examining the need for this program, the Committee has relied on documentation from Trent University, including letters written in support of the program. The Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program is a multidisciplinary program designed "to provide graduates with public sector or consulting skills."[1] Trent notes that multidisciplinary skills are also of growing importance to the private sector in the areas of native and environmental research.

Program emphasis will be on the development and presentation of a thesis under the direction of a faculty supervisor and a three-person thesis committee, one of whom is drawn from outside the academic community. In addition, students are required to take two graduate courses. The Frost Centre Colloquium is a multidisciplinary seminar in which all students are enrolled; the other course is in one of the program "clusters" (native studies, regionalism, or environmental/heritage studies). Trent indicates that aspects of northern studies can be a part of each of the three clusters.[2] While the Frost Centre Colloquium is concerned with the discussion of philosophical and multidisciplinary questions in a broad context, the cluster courses focus more narrowly on the interdisciplinary study of issues related to a particular area.

---

[1] Trent University, Response to Request for Additional Information, July 14, 1986, p. 1.

Trent asserts that there is a societal need for graduates familiar with multidisciplinary analytical techniques applicable to Canadian development issues. As indicated by Mr. Thomas R. Berger:

> ...it is vital to take such an approach [interdisciplinary] to important questions relating to the Northern Environment, Northern land use, Northern resource development, Native rights and so on. Of course it is true that there are sound academic programmes grounded in each discipline, but there is an absolutely essential place for institutions such as the Frost Centre which try to release the needed information from the water-tight compartments often erected by arbitrary disciplinary classifications.[3]

This position is supported by a submission from a representative of Parks Canada:

> There is no question in my mind that the new graduate program in Heritage and Development Studies at the Frost Centre will go a long way in filling a gap that has long existed in interdisciplinary studies. As our present and future world starves for information and analysis, this program offers special skills in dealing with wide ranging environmental, cultural and economic problems. It is a new way of seeing, one that is becoming more important at many levels of

---

[2] Trent University, Response to Request for Additional Information, November 10, 1986, pp. 3 and 4.

[3] Letter written in support of the Canadian Heritage and Development Studies Program by Mr. Thomas R. Berger, June 18, 1986.

research.[4]

Letters of support provided by Trent indicate that the demand for graduates with multidisciplinary backgrounds in Canadian Studies will increase over time as additional northern development gives rise to more complex political, environmental and social issues requiring government policy decisions. They also suggest that graduates with a multi-disciplinary background in Canadian heritage and development will be able to find useful employment in the public sector. For example, the Director of Northern Affairs, Intergovernmental Affairs Directorate of Environment Canada indicates:

> ...the creation of a new academic centre with an interest in northern studies is very timely. The North's economic (as a supplier of resources), strategic (e.g. North Warning System) and political (e.g., sovereignty, political evolution) importance is growing, making the North an increasingly obvious subject of study. More importantly, the North is in the midst of rapid political change and faces as a result a host of difficult policy questions...
>
> An academic program focussing on these linkages [between academic disciplines] would graduate students who were better-equipped to work as policy analysts, either for government or large corporations. These students, I believe, would be far more attractive candidates for jobs than "technicians" who had mastered only one discipline. As one who has interviewed graduate students for employment in the federal civil service, I can attest that those who impress are versatile and have a varied academic background.[5]

There appears to be a student demand for the program. Trent accepted six students into the program for the 1986 fall term, including one student from China. Based on the number of serious applications received prior to the advertisement of the program (24), Trent fully expects to reach its steady state enrolment projection of 20 students by 1990.

---

[4] Letter from Mr. Larry Turner, Parks Canada, to Mr. Robert Page, Frost Centre, Trent University, June 29, 1986.

[5] Letter from Mr. Francois Bregha, Director, Northern Affairs, Intergovernmental Affairs Directorate, Environment Canada to Dr. Robert Page, Director, Frost Centre, Trent University, November 18, 1985.

On the basis of evidence illustrating the need for graduates with a multidisciplinary background in native studies, regionalism, and environmental and heritage studies, combined with evidence of student demand for the program, the Committee accepts that this program meets Council's criteria for societal need and student demand.

3. Uniqueness

The Committee acknowledges that there are no programs in Ontario or Canada with a multidisciplinary structure and total course content similar to the Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program at Trent.

The Committee notes similarities between the focus of the Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program and courses available in the Master of Environmental Studies program offered at York University, and in the Master of Arts in Canadian Studies program available at Carleton University, however, there was no evidence of program duplication. Most interdisciplinary programs currently available offer interdisciplinary core courses complemented by a discipline-based selection of courses for concentration. Trent has developed a multidisciplinary program of study, wherein all courses are either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary theme courses, which does not offer a discipline-based "shopping list" of courses.

The Committee believes that the case for uniqueness lies not in the range of courses available, but in the multidisciplinary nature of the colloquium course, the interdisciplinary nature of each of the cluster courses, and the range of topics covered within each of these courses. The Committee understands that the multidisciplinary emphasis of the program will be fostered by the participation of the program coordinator, and of at least three faculty members from different disciplinary areas in each session of the colloquium.[6] The Committee also notes that the Program Director is involved in all three cluster courses to ensure that interrelationships among the clusters are maintained.[7]

---

[6] Trent University, Response to Request for Additional Information, November 10, 1986, p. 1.

Based on the foregoing information, the Committee is satisfied that this program meets Council's uniqueness criterion.

4. Aims, Objectives and Existing Strengths

Trent University is currently the only university in the province engaged almost entirely in undergraduate Arts and Science instruction. The university was founded on the concept of intensive interpersonal interaction and interdisciplinary approaches to learning, with the objective of providing a broad and scholarly educational background in the Arts and Sciences.

While Trent became identified with interdisciplinary approaches to undergraduate teaching, its graduate programming originally developed along more traditional, disciplinary lines. In response to Council's efforts to focus Trent's role more specifically on undergraduate Arts and Science instruction, Trent suspended a number of its established, single-discipline graduate programs. As a reflection of its interdisciplinary strengths at the undergraduate level, Trent was encouraged to create multi-disciplinary "umbrella" graduate programs in areas where it had special strengths and the ability to make a distinctive contribution to post-secondary education in Ontario. The pruning and consolidation of Trent's graduate offerings and the development of multi-disciplinary programs is a condition of the continuation of Trent's differentiation grant.[8]

---

[7] Ibid., p. 1.

[8] In 1981-82, Council introduced a new category of extra-formula funding, known as differentiation grants, available to institutions which accepted a clearly differentiated role, demonstrated an intention to pursue their strengths efficiently and effectively and required special funding to do so. In recognition of the understanding which developed between Trent and Council concerning the rationalization of Trent's graduate offerings, Trent has received a differentiation grant since 1981-82.

Canadian Heritage and Development Studies is the first such multidisciplinary program to be formally submitted for funding approval since the differentiation grant was established, and is contained in Trent's five-year graduate plan. The multidisciplinary focus of this program is supported by the Frost Centre for Canadian Heritage and Development Studies. This Centre acts as an umbrella under which multidisciplinary faculty research can be given impetus and support.

Trent has defined strengths in areas related to each of the three clusters of the Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program. Related interdisciplinary programs at the undergraduate level include Canadian Studies, Native Studies, Environmental and Resource Studies, Administration and Policy Studies, Comparative Development, Cultural Studies and Computer Studies. Trent is known for its pioneering interdisciplinary-based teaching and research. The proposed program is an extension of existing undergraduate strengths at Trent.

Evidence of Trent's strength in the area of Canadian Studies is further revealed by publication activities there. Trent faculty founded or played a central role in the creation of three of the leading journals in the Canadian Studies field; The Journal of Canadian Studies, The Canadian Journal of Native Studies and Alternatives (a Canadian academic environmental quarterly).[9]

A 1983 study of environmental research activity in Canada commends Trent's achievements in interdisciplinary research:

> Many small universities have specialized in a particular environmental research area in which they co-ordinate the teaching and research activities of many departments. The result ...is a quality of work which is much higher than is produced by some of the larger and more diverse universities. A good example is the research and teaching work of Trent University in Peterborough ...the Trent Library also has probably one of the best environmental government document sections in

---

[9] Trent University, Response to Request for Additional Information, March 17, 1986, p. 12.

the country...[10]

In addition to current faculty research strengths, Trent has established a Visiting Chair of Northern Studies which will assist in the attraction of outstanding scholars to the university. Leading academics meet annually at Trent for the Frost Centre Colloquium. The Research arm of the Frost Centre was recently awarded $25,000 by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) to host a conference leading to a publication on interdisciplinary research in Canadian Studies.[11]

The Canadian Heritage and Development Studies program appears to be consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the University and with the defined role which Trent has agreed to with Council. The Committee notes that this program is consistent with Trent's defined role in the graduate area if it continues as a unified, multidisciplinary program as described under the "Uniqueness" criterion.

The Committee suggests that Council assure itself on a continuing basis, within the context of the differentiation grant process, that the multidisciplinary emphasis of the program is maintained in order that it does not become merely a vehicle for the existence of individual interdisciplinary programs. Such a development would be contrary to Council's objectives for Trent in the graduate program area.

5. Funding

The Committee, therefore, recommends to Council that:

> the Master of Arts in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies at Trent University be recommended by Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
November 20, 1986

---

[10] Bruce Rigby, *Environmental Research Activity in Canada*, presented at the Environmental Impact Assessment Conference, May 3-4, 1983, Toronto, p. 10.

[11] Trent University, *Response to Request for Additional Information*, March 18, 1986, p. 3.

Appendix C

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science (PhD)
University of Western Ontario
New Graduate Program Considered for Formula Funding

On August 5, 1986, the University of Western Ontario requested that Council consider its new Doctor of Philosophy program in Computer Science (PhD) for funding approval. Council, according to established procedures, referred the program to its Academic Advisory Committee. The Committee's findings with respect to the application of Council's funding criteria are summarized below.

1. Academic Appraisal

The Council of Ontario Universities has certified that this program has passed a rigorous academic appraisal (February 21, 1986) and, at the time of appraisal, did not require any improvements.

2. Need

In assessing the need for a doctoral program in Computer Science at the University of Western Ontario, the Committee has relied on information provided by Western, the Canadian Information Processing Society (CIPS) and information contained in the Committee's recent report on the Queen's University Computing and Information Science PhD program.

In December, 1985, the Academic Advisory Committee recommended funding of a doctoral program in computer science at Queen's. At that time, the Committee was provided with overwhelming evidence, from Queen's and the Canadian Information Processing Society, which documented the need for doctoral graduates in this field.

The University of Western Ontario argues that an enormous need for computer science PhD's persists in industry and academia and that the approval of its program will enable the Ontario university system to respond to this need in a more timely and effective manner without contributing to an overproduction of doctoral graduates in this field. In support of its proposal, the University of Western Ontario cites the well-documented shortage of PhD Computer Science graduates in Canada and the United States noted by publications of the "Snowbird" Conferences. The Snowbird Report, a document issued biennially as a result of conferences of the Chairmen of Canadian and American PhD-granting Computer Science Departments held in Snowbird, Utah, reviews the need for doctoral graduates in Computer Science in North America.

The Report suggests that the significant shortage of Computer Science PhD's in academia and industry is a direct result of the small number of graduate students enrolling in PhD programs. The 1984 Snowbird Report indicated that at that time the shortage of academic computer scientists in North America was severe:

> ...there were over 200 vacancies last academic year in the 56 departments reporting out of 91 PhD granting departments in North America. At the same time, only approximately 250 PhD's were granted in North America, a figure that has remained relatively unchanged for the past several years. Many of these 250 accepted positions in industry; a significant percentage was foreign students who returned to their native countries. The issue is clear. There were far fewer PhD's granted than were needed to fill the positions reported, disregarding the remaining 35 PhD - granting departments and the hundreds of other academic positions seeking PhD - level faculty to teach computer science courses in departments offering MSc, BSc and other degrees.[1]

The Committee acknowledges evidence indicating a continuing shortage of doctoral computer science graduates in Canada. Information provided by the University of Western Ontario indicates that the annual output of Canadian doctoral graduates from 1980 through 1983 fell from 25 to 20 graduates per year, while macroindicator data indicated a similar trend in Ontario, where there were 17 graduates in 1980-81

---

1. The 1984 Snowbird Report - Future Issues in Computer Science, Communication of the ACM, May 1985, p. 491.

compared to 15 in 1983-84 and only 12 in 1984-85.[2]

In a document prepared by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, "Research Talent in the Natural Sciences and Engineering, Supply and Demand Projections to 1990", the Committee noted that conservative growth projections for the Canadian economy indicate a significant shortage of approximately 30 doctoral graduates per year in the Physical Sciences and Mathematics to 1990. If greater increases in economic growth and research and development occur, the shortfall is expected to increase to between 200 and 300 doctoral graduates.[3] The Report warns that:

> any attempt to increase Research and Development expenditure as a percentage of GNP (GERD/GNP) will be severely limited by a shortage of skilled manpower. Furthermore, to achieve any reasonable levels of national Research and Development literacy during the 1990's, the process of building for that growth must begin now.[4]

The shortage in Canada is compounded by the recruiting efforts of American corporations and universities which are able to attract Canadian doctoral graduates through higher industrial and academic salaries.[5]

Western considers significant foreign graduate student losses to be a factor contributing to the shortage of PhD's in Ontario and Canada.[6] It is also the case that there is a relatively large number of visa students in computing programs:

---

[2] The University of Western Ontario, Application for Approval of Funding of a Doctoral Programme in Computer Science at the University of Western Ontario, p. 3.

[3] Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Completing the Bridge to the 1990's, June, 1985, p. 129, cited in Academic Advisory Committee Report to the Ontario Council on University Affairs, Computing and Information Science (PhD), Queen's University, New Graduate Program Considered for Formula Funding, pp. 3-4.

[4] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[5] University of Western Ontario, Application for Approval of Funding of a Doctoral Program in Computer Science at the University of Western Ontario, p. 2.

> Macroindicator data for June 1985 indicate that in the two programmes at Toronto and Waterloo over the last five years, the international student component is 25% and 57% respectively for an average of 36.5% and accordingly, one may not expect all of the graduates of these programs to remain in Canada.[7]

The Committee believes that the combination of high Canadian demand for academic computer scientists, industrial consumption of graduates in Canada and the United States, potential foreign student loss and the ability of American universities to attract Canadian academics through higher salaries, indicates that the demand for Computer Science doctoral graduates in Ontario and Canada will not be met for some time.

The Committee notes the recent approval (1985) of a doctoral program in Computer Science at Queen's University which has a projected steady state enrolment of 15 students per year by 1987-88. The Committee does not consider the addition of another doctoral program in this field to be unwarranted given the current demand for graduates. In support of this position, the Committee considers information which it received from the Canadian Information Processing Society, relating to the Queen's program, to be of continuing relevance. With regard to the need for PhD graduates in Computer Science, CIPS indicated in 1985 that:

> ...if there is an error, it is in understating the size of the problem. In our visits to Canadian Universities, we have encountered a consistent requirement for PhD's to fill academic positions, and the expressed concern about the lack of suitable candidates...it is our belief that the industry is going to grow more rapidly than the Universities can increase their capacity to produce PhD. graduates in Computer Science. The current shortage is likely to become worse in the longer term - not better. For these reasons, CIPS

---

[6] Ibid., p. 3.

[7] Ibid., p. 3.

> supports an increase in good PhD. programs in Canada.[8]

By letter of January 12, 1987, CIPS provided information to AAC confirming the ongoing shortage of supply of PhD Computer Science graduates and the continuing need for doctoral level programs in Ontario.[9]

The Committee believes that the proposed program at Western, with a projected steady-state enrolment of 10 to 12 students, should help meet the demand for computer science graduates without contributing to an over-production of doctoral candidates.

During the first year of the program, Western intends to admit 5 to 6 students. Without the aid of advertising, 45 letters requesting application forms for the program were received from outside the University. From within the University, five students currently enrolled in the master's program at Western have applied for admission to the PhD program. The Master of Computer Science program at Western produces between five and fifteen graduates annually.

There are three doctoral programs in computer science in Ontario, at the University of Toronto, University of Waterloo, and Queen's University. Enrolment in the Toronto program is at capacity with 71 full-time students and 5 part-time students. Approximately 15 new enrolments are accepted each year. An average of 8 doctoral graduates is produced annually. The University of Toronto has no plans to increase doctoral enrolment at this time.[10]

The doctoral program at the University of Waterloo admits approximately 10 new students per year and plans to continue to increase total enrolment by approximately

---

[8] Letter from Mr. Gary Hadford, Past President, CIPS National CMC, CDP, CCP to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, November 27, 1985.

[9] Letter to the Ontario Council on University Affairs from Mr. Gaylen A. Duncan, Vice-President, CIPS, January 12, 1987.

[10] Telephone Conversation with Professor J.N.P. Hume, Graduate Co-ordinator, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, September 15, 1986.

10 students per year to 1994. Current enrolment levels are at 68 full-time and 2 part-time students. Waterloo produces between 6 and 7 doctoral graduates each year.[11]

The doctoral program in computer science at Queen's has been in existence since only 1985. There are seven students enrolled in 1986-87, and this number will increase to 15 in 1987-88. Queen's University may continue to increase its total capacity given the increasing student demand for doctoral level study in the computer science field.[12]

The Committee believes that the amount of evidence indicating the size and long-term nature of the demand for doctoral graduates in computer science justifies the creation of an additional doctoral program in the province despite the potential increases in capacity of existing programs at the University of Waterloo and Queen's University.

On the basis of evidence illustrating the significant need for additional PhD Computer Science graduates in industry and academia, in Canada and the United States, and which demonstrates an increasing student demand for PhD Computer Science programs, the Committee is satisfied that this program meets Council's criteria for societal need and student demand.

3. Uniqueness

The doctoral programs in Computer Science which exist at Toronto, Waterloo and Queen's are comprehensive in their coverage of the discipline. The content of the program proposed by Western generally overlaps what is offered in existing programs at these institutions. However, innovative research and teaching is proceeding at Western in the area of Digital Imaging involving three-dimensional graphics and computer applications to medicine. While acknowledging that there will be duplication, the Committee considers this justifiable, noting the considerable evidence which suggests that the demand for PhD graduates is substantial, that projections indicate rapid growth in the field of computing science and technology, and that the need for doctoral graduates in this field will persist far into the future.

---

[11] Telephone Conversation with Professor D. Wood, Graduate Officer, Department of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, September 16, 1986.

[12] Telephone Conversation with Professor S.G. Akl, Graduate Officer, Department of Computer Science, Queen's University, September 16, 1986.

4. Aims, Objectives and Existing Strengths

The Department of Computer Science at Western currently offers an undergraduate and a master's program, which have been in existence for over 20 years. Recent increases in the number of faculty have contributed to a departmental strengthening.

The department has close links with the Faculty of Engineering Science, which offers a variety of doctoral programs. Well established doctoral programs are offered in the related departments of Applied Mathematics, Mathematics, Statistics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Geology, Geophysics and Physics. The Department of Computer Science plays a leading role in the Centre for Cognitive Studies which is made up of philosophers, psychologists and computer scientists.

The Doctoral program in Computer Science is included in Western's five-year graduate plan and is entirely consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the University.

5. Funding

The Committee therefore, recommends to Council that:

> the doctoral program in Computer Science at the University of Western Ontario be recommended by Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
November 20, 1986

Appendix D

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation,
University of Ottawa
New Graduate Program Considered for Formula Funding

On April 25, 1986, the University of Ottawa requested that Council consider its new Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation for funding approval. Council, according to established procedures, referred the program to its Academic Advisory Committee. The Committee's findings with respect to the application of Council's funding criteria are summarized below.

1. Academic Appraisal

The Council of Ontario Universities has certified that this program has passed a rigorous academic appraisal (March 21, 1986) and, at the time of appraisal, did not require any improvements.

2. Need

The University of Ottawa's proposed Diploma program in Legal Translation is a professionally-oriented program, the objective of which is to train graduates capable of translating different types of legal texts, most dealing with the Common Law system, from English into French. The University intends to accept only students whose dominant language is French and who have previously obtained an undergraduate degree in either law or translation. French will be the language of instruction for all courses. An eight week practicum component at the end of the program provides students with the opportunity for hands-on experience in the legal translation field prior to graduation.

Evidence provided by the University of Ottawa indicates that almost every region of the country has developed a need for legal translators. The Committee notes that in response to the tremendous growth in the demand for legal translation skills throughout Canada, four legal translation units have been established within the federal government, and one each within the governments of New Brunswick, Manitoba and Ontario.[1] Special legal translation centres have been established at the University of Moncton and the University of Ottawa.

In its submission, the University of Ottawa notes three factors which indicate that there is a societal need for the program:

1. There is a continuous demand for legal translators from the Centre de traduction et de terminologie juridiques de l'Universite de Moncton, the Centre de traduction et de docu-mentation juridiques de l'Universite d'Ottawa, and in other legal translation units.

2. The current shortage is such that the federal government is often asked to "loan" its legal translators to help set up new legal translation units. This was the case in the development of the legal translation unit in Manitoba and the Centre de traduction et de documentation juridiques de l'Universite d'Ottawa.

3. Demand for legal translation skills has resulted in much legal translation being done on a freelance basis by the same legal translators who are full-time employees of existing translation units.[2]

Letters of support submitted by the University of Ottawa for the proposed Diploma program in Legal Translation revealed concern over the severe shortage of competent legal translators and the belief that the implementation of this program would remedy the situation. The Executive Committee of the National Project for the Administration of Justice in Both Official Languages, representing a wide range of groups which utilize legal translation skills, strongly recommended that the University of Ottawa establish a program of higher education in legal translation.[3]

---

[1] On November 18, 1986 the Government of Ontario passed Bill 8, which guarantees that Government agencies will offer services in French in areas where francophones number at least 5,000 or constitute 10% of the population in a given area. This legislation requires that all existing laws be translated into French by 1991, and thus creates an even greater demand for legal translation skills in Ontario.

[2] University of Ottawa, Response to Request for Additional Information, July 21, 1986, p. 5.

The Academic Advisory Committee was also provided with letters of support for the program from the French services co-ordinator of the Ministry of the Attorney General in Ontario, the Associate Undersecretary of State for Official Languages and Translation, the President of the Association des juristes d'expression francais de l'Ontario, the Director of the Centre de traduction et de documentation juridiques, and the Senior Legislative Counsel, Department of Justice.

All letters point to the immediate need for legal translation skills and indicate an increased demand for legal translators over the long-term. Many letter-writers pledged to incorporate graduates into their organizations to ensure the success of the program. Letters indicate that the need for translators possessing both legal and linguistic backgrounds, who can translate legal and legislative texts, and who can prepare materials for those who wish to practice law or plead in French, will be ameliorated by this program. Without this program the present scarcity of legal translators is expected to worsen.[4]

---

3. Letter from Rejean Patry, Coordinator, National Project for the Administration of Justice in Both Official Languages, to the Honourable Bette Stevenson, February 6, 1984, p. 2.

   Membership of the National Project for the Administration of Justice in Both Official Languages includes the Secretary of State, the Federal Department of Justice, the Offices of the Attorney General of Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick, the law associations of these provinces, Moncton, Ottawa and McGill universities, the Association des juristes d'expression franco-manitobains, the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Law Information Council.

4. Letter from Mr. Gerard Bertrand, Senior Legislative Counsel, Department of Justice, Canada, to Mrs. Roda Roberts, Director, School of Translators and Interpretors, University of Ottawa, April 7, 1986.

The Committee understands that there is no formal training currently available in the field of legal translation. Legal translators are presently drawn from the existing pool of law or translation graduates. Both groups currently acquire their legal translation skills on the job. The University of Ottawa indicates that the effectiveness of on-the-job training is presently limited by the small number of senior legal translators and their ability to teach their skills to others.

From the evidence provided, the Committee is convinced that a societal need for a professionally-oriented program which trains graduates in the field of legal translation is both urgent and longterm.

The University of Ottawa expects student demand for their Graduate Diploma program in Legal Translation to be high. In the first year of the program the University plans to admit a total of 20 students (10 with an undergraduate background in law and an equal number with a background in translation). By 1990-91, Ottawa projects a steady-state enrolment of 40 students, with law and translation graduates equally represented. The program expects to draw on francophone graduates of the University of Ottawa School of Translators and Interpreters undergraduate program, graduates of the nine other Honours Translation programs in Canada and francophone law graduates. The program will also draw on currently employed legal translators wishing to upgrade their knowledge and skills.

Student interest in the program is evidenced by the numerous inquiries received about the program by the University of Ottawa (5 to 10 calls per week since 1983-84).[5]

On the basis of this evidence the Committee is satisfied that there exists both a societal need and student demand for the program.

3. Uniqueness

The Graduate Diploma program in Legal Translation proposed by the University of Ottawa is unique in Ontario and Canada. This program will be the first to combine the disciplines of law and translation in a professionally-oriented program for the purpose of training students in the skills of legal translation.

---

[5] University of Ottawa, Request for Funding, Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation, April 25, 1986, p. 2.

The Committee is satisfied that this program meets Council's uniqueness criterion.

4. Aims, Objectives and Existing Strengths

The proposed program is consistent with the University of Ottawa's commitment to further bilingualism and biculturalism and to preserve and develop French culture in Ontario. Complementary strengths at the University of Ottawa include a School of Translators and Interpreters, the Faculty of Law with Common and Civil Law components, le Centre de traduction et de documentation located on campus, an MA program in Translation, and an MA and a PhD program in Linguistics.

The program is included in the University's five-year graduate plan and is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the University.

5. Funding

The Committee, therefore, recommends to Council that:

> the Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation at the University of Ottawa be recommended by Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
November 20, 1986

86-IX UNDERGRADUATE QUASI-PROFESSIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM FUNDING

I. **Undergraduate Quasi-Professional Programs**
Administrative and Information Studies Stream, Administrative and Commercial Studies Program (BA), University of Western Ontario;
Gerontology and Another Subject (BA and Honours BA), McMaster University;
Hispanic Studies (Combined Honours BA [Major and Minor] and General Honours BA [Major]), York University (Glendon College);
Labour Studies (Honours BA), McMaster University;
Music Performance (Honours BMus), McMaster University;
Portuguese Studies (BA Minor), York University (Glendon College).

II. **Undergraduate Professional Programs**
Civil Engineering and Computer Systems (BEng), McMaster University;
Materials Engineering (BEng), McMaster University.

I. Undergraduate Quasi-Professional Programs

Administrative and Information Studies Stream, Administrative and Commercial Studies Program (BA), University of Western Ontario

On February 12, 1986, the University of Western Ontario requested that Council consider for funding approval a new undergraduate quasi-professional concentration in Administrative and Information Studies (AIS) within the Administrative and Commercial Studies program. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the proposal to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). Institutional responses indicated that there were no objections to the proposal.

1. Proposed Curriculum

The concentration in Administrative and Information Studies is the result of a transformation of the BA program in Administrative Office Management Studies, offered by the Department of Secretarial and Administrative Studies, which will be phased out by 1991.[1]

The new program emphasizes the administration, control, management and distribution of information and the utilization of the financial, human and physical resources of an organization. Other courses are drawn from existing programs in economics, computer science, psychology and sociology.

2. Academic Quality

Council notes that the Administrative and Information Studies stream was approved by the Senate of the University of Western Ontario on April 10, 1986.

3. Financial Viability

Council accepts the University of Western Ontario's statement that the Administrative and Information Studies stream has the support of the University and is financially viable.[2]

4. Projected Enrolment

The University of Western Ontario projects a steady-state enrolment of 40 students per year by 1988 for a total enrolment of 120 students.

5. Co-operation with other Post-Secondary Institutions

No co-operation with other institutions is planned.

---

[1] The University of Western Ontario, Request for Funding Administrative and Information Studies, February 12, 1986, p. 1.

[2] The University of Western Ontario, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, August 6, 1986, p. 1.

6. Societal Need and Student Demand

The University of Western Ontario indicates that there is a very strong student demand for courses in the field of Administrative and Information Studies and that demand for the Administrative and Commercial Studies program currently exceeds capacity.[3] The University expects no difficulty in achieving its enrolment objective of 40 students in each year of the Administrative and Information Studies stream.

Council notes that committees established by the University to design this new stream had considerable and ongoing interaction with a variety of organizations and, as a result, were confident that graduates would possess the skills necessary to meet the needs of potential employers.[4]

Results of a mail survey of over one hundred companies and of interviews conducted with a wide range of private and public sector corporations, confirmed to the University that graduates of the Administrative and Information Studies stream would be "a good source of potential employees" for organizations seeking to fill entry-level administrative positions in the areas of marketing, finance, personnel or general administration.[5]

Council is satisfied that there is both a student demand and a societal need for this program.

7. Uniqueness

Council is satisfied that the Administrative and Information Studies stream of the Administrative and Commercial Studies program is sufficiently different in emphasis from other similar programs currently offered.

---

3. Ibid., p. 1.

4. The University of Western Ontario, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, November 10, 1986, pp. 2-3.

5. Ibid., p. 3

8. Local and Regional Support for the Program

Council is satisfied that there is both local and regional support for the proposed new stream.

9. Institutional Appropriateness

Council recognizes that the Administrative and Information Studies stream is the result of a transformation of existing offerings, involving the phasing out of an existing BA program in Administrative Office Management Studies, a reduction in the size of the Department of Secretarial and Administrative Studies and a strengthening of the existing program in Administrative and Commercial Studies. This would appear to be an appropriate restructuring of program offerings, building upon existing program strengths.

10. Funding in a Time of Constraint

Since the creation of the Administrative and Information Studies stream results from a transformation of many existing courses, is meeting student and societal needs and is financially viable, Council recommends this program for formula support, even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-28 **FUNDING FOR THE ADMINISTATIVE AND INFORMATION STUDIES STREAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the Administrative and Information Studies stream of the BA program in Administrative and Commercial Studies at the University of Western Ontario be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving average for the university - the program to be in Category 1, with a weight of 1.0, as outlined in the Ministry's *Operating Formula Manual*.

Gerontology and Another Subject (BA and Honours BA), McMaster University

On February 4, 1986, McMaster University requested that Council consider for funding approval two new undergraduate quasi-professional programs in Gerontology and Another Subject. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the proposals to the Council of Ontario Universities. Institutional responses indicated that there was general support throughout the system for the establishment of these gerontology programs, however some concerns were raised about the limited amount of theory and practical experience in the programs.[6]

1. Proposed Curriculum

Both the BA and Honours BA programs are administered by the Faculty of Social Sciences through the Office of Gerontological Studies. These programs are multidisciplinary, drawing principally on the resources of the Faculties of Social Sciences and Health Sciences, with additional assistance from the Faculty of Science and Humanities. Students are admitted to the programs, which combine Gerontology with another subject, in second year. However, they must meet the requirements for a BA or Honours BA program in the other subject selected.

Gerontology courses cover the biological, international, psychological and multidisciplinary aspects of gerontology and aging. A one-term practicum, involving three hours of field experience per week, is a required component of the programs.

2. Academic Quality

Council notes that the programs received Senate approval on February 12, 1986.

---

[6] Letter from Dr. Edward J. Monahan, Executive Director, Council of Ontario Universities, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, November 10, 1986.

3. Financial Viability

McMaster indicates that resource implications were considered and endorsed by the joint Board/Senate Committee on Academic Planning. Financial demands are expected to be modest since existing resources will be utilized and program enrolments are expected to result from a redistribution of existing students.

4. Projected Enrolment

McMaster does not anticipate a significant increase in full-time students as a result of these programs. Since full-time enrolment in the Faculty of Social Sciences is limited, these programs are expected to effect a redistribution of the existing number of students. For the BA program, McMaster anticipates an initial year-2 enrolment of 25, a steady-state enrolment of 50 students in each of year 2 and 3, and a 15 student steady-state enrolment in the Honours stream, for a total of 115 students in the programs.[7]

The only change in enrolment for the Faculty of Social Sciences is expected to occur in part-time student numbers. The programs are expected to attract up to an additional 100 part-time students, many of whom have already obtained BA degrees and are currently working with the aged.

5. Co-operation With Other Post-Secondary Institutions

No co-operation with other institutions is planned.

6. Student Demand and Societal Need

As indicated by enrolment projections, McMaster anticipates a strong student demand for these programs from both full-time and part-time students. Council notes that over 800 students are currently enrolled in gerontology-related courses offered at McMaster.

McMaster indicates that there will be an increasing societal need for graduates who can effectively respond to the demands of Canada's aging population. Based on discussions with potential employers and on studies conducted in the United States, McMaster expects graduates to find employment in a variety of positions such as retirement counsellors and educators, research assistants, program planners and co-ordinators, consultants on aging-related programs, staff members of gerontological and geriatric scientific and educational organizations, and nursing-home administrators.[8]

---

[7] McMaster University, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, June 10, 1986, p. 3.

Council is satisfied that there is both a societal need and a student demand for these programs.

7. Uniqueness

Council acknowledges that at this time the programs proposed by McMaster are unique, since they are the first Gerontology BA programs to be offered in Ontario. However COU comments reveal that the University of Western Ontario and York University anticipate the development of programs in this area. Council also notes that the University of Guelph has proposed a BSc program in Gerontology.

8. Local and Regional Support for the Program

Education and research activities at McMaster are co-ordinated by the Office of Gerontological Studies. McMaster notes that this Office is structurally linked with the R. Samuel McLaughlin Centre for Gerontological Health Research. The Office and the Centre collaborate in the printing of a regular newsletter, and in sponsoring conferences, workshops and lectures.Representatives of local agencies serving the health and social needs of the elderly have served on various ad hoc planning committees and will serve on the Advisory Council of the Office of Gerontological Studies. Additional links between the University and health and social service professionals have been developed through the McMaster hospital network. These contacts will enable students to do course practica in local agencies under the supervision of faculty and agency representatives.

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Council is satisfied that there is local and regional support for the program.

9. Institutional Appropriateness

Given the projected increase in the number of elderly people in society, that these gerontology programs are complemented by strong undergraduate programs in the social sciences, health sciences and humanities, and that the R. Samuel McLaughlin Centre for Gerontological Health Research is funded to investigate the health implications of an aging population,[9] Council believes that these programs are an appropriate development at McMaster University.

10. Funding in a Time of Constraint

Since there is both student demand and societal need for these programs, they will meet a regional need for the upgrading of skills, and will not involve significant additional resources, Council believes that these programs should be recommended for funding, even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-29

FUNDING FOR THE BACHELOR OF ARTS AND HONOURS BACHELOR OF ARTS PROGRAMS IN GERONTOLOGY AND ANOTHER SUBJECT AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89

THAT, the BA and Honours BA programs in Gerontology and Another Subject at McMaster University be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving average for the university - the bachelor's program to be in Category 1 with a weight of 1.0, and the upper years of the honours program to be in Category 2 with a weight of 1.5, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

---

[9] McMaster University, Request for Funding, BA and BA Honours in Gerontology and Another Subject, Feb. 4, 1986. p. 1.

Hispanic Studies (Combined Honours BA [Major and Minor] and General Honours BA [Major]), York University (Glendon College)

On October 2, 1985, York University requested that Council consider for funding approval two new undergraduate quasi-professional programs in Hispanic Studies. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the proposals to the Council of Ontario Universities. The institutional responses indicated that there were no objections to the proposal.

1. Proposed Curriculum

The new programs are based on Glendon's existing minor option in Hispanic Studies. The proposed Combined Honours program would require students to take six courses for the Major in Hispanic Studies or four courses for the Minor, combined with an Honours program in another subject. The General Honours program would require students to take six courses in Hispanic Studies.

From a selection of six full courses, fifteen half courses, Selected Topic and Individual Studies courses, Glendon will offer the equivalent of at least six to eight full courses in each academic year.[10] Courses will emphasize language and linguistics, Spanish literature and culture, and Spanish-American civilization, culture and society.

2. Academic Quality

The proposed programs received Senate approval on June 26, 1986.

3. Financial Viability

Council accepts York's statement that the programs can be mounted without requiring additional appointments or new resources of any kind.[11]

---

[10] York University, Request for Funding, Hispanic Studies, October 2, 1985, p. 2.

4. Projected Enrolment

York indicates that since the establishment of the minor option in Hispanic Studies in 1971, enrolment has been stable at roughly 10% of the total enrolment at Glendon College. A similar pattern of enrolment in Hispanic Studies is projected for the next five years.[12] Council notes that there has been an average of 156 students enrolled in Hispanic Studies at Glendon over the past five years with the lowest enrolment of 138 students occurring in 1981-82 and the highest enrolment of 173 students occurring in 1985-86.[13]

5. Co-operation with other Post-Secondary Institutions

In the past, the Hispanic Studies group has been involved in an exchange of resources and staff with the Universities of Ottawa, Waterloo, McMaster, and Wilfrid Laurier.[14]

Some faculty members from the University of Toronto's Department of Spanish and Portuguese are cross-appointed at Glendon College. Council notes that Glendon's frequent use of University of Toronto graduate students, as part-time teaching assistants, promotes additional interaction between these two institutions.[15]

Council believes that York's submission indicates a significant amount of interaction between the Hispanic Studies section at Glendon and a variety of Hispanic associations and institutions in Ontario and abroad.

---

11. York University, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, February 20, 1986, p. 3.

12. Ibid., p. 1.

13. Ibid., p. 3.

14. Ibid., p. 1.

15. Ibid., p. 1.

6. Societal Need and Student Demand

York University indicates that students currently enrolled in the minor option in Spanish offered at Glendon College have requested that major options in Spanish be made available to them.

York argues that:

> ...students of a bilingual arts college have a strong need to learn at least a third major language...The need of students in such programmes as Translation, International Studies, Political Sciences and Linguistics, to take courses in Hispanic Studies is quite important, considering that Spanish is one of the four major languages in the world.[16]

However York also indicates that:

> Most of the students who would take advantage of the new degree options already take the required number of courses.[17]

Council believes that the students of Glendon College who wish to study a third language currently have the opportunity to do so and that adding an honours degree will not increase the service functions currently available at Glendon College. Further, Council notes that the students' existing opportunity to study Spanish would not be enhanced by the creation of the proposed honours programs since the college does not intend to add new courses to the existing curriculum.[18]

Therefore, in view of these factors, Council believes that existing opportunities to study Spanish will not be enhanced by the proposed new programs although a demand for degree recognition appears to exist.

In its submissions to Council, York notes that there are approximately 100,000 hispanophones living in Ontario, 75,000 to 80,000 of whom live in the Toronto region. York indicates that a Hispanic Studies program:

---

[16] Ibid., p. 2.

[17] Ibid., p. 3.

[18] York University, Request for Funding, Hispanic Studies, October 2, 1985, pp. 3-4.

> ...serves the unique needs of students interested in learning a third language in a bilingual setting, students interested in Spanish and Latin American Studies, students whose mother tongue is Spanish and members of the Toronto Hispanophone community.[19]

Fourteen of the fifteen universities in Ontario currently offer an honours program in Spanish language and literature. The exception, Laurentian, offers a three-year general degree.

However, Council's review of enrolment capacity in the system revealed significant excess capacity within existing Hispanic Studies programs. Council found that there were 15 programs offering Honours or Specialist programs in Spanish, including York University, the University of Toronto, and its Erindale and Scarborough campuses.

Of particular concern to Council is that excess capacity exists at the York University main campus program, the University of Toronto main campus, Erindale campus and Scarborough campus, and the University of Ottawa, a bilingual institution. Brock, Carleton, Guelph, McMaster, Queen's, Trent, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier and Windsor universities, also indicated they had excess capacity in their programs.

In its survey of existing Spanish programs, Council found that all Spanish courses offered in existing programs are taught completely in Spanish, with only the most limited use of English or French required at the introductory level for the purpose of grammatical clarifications. Council also found that, since only Spanish is spoken during class instruction, the francophone students at other institutions have performed as well as the anglophones. If French translation were required at the introductory course level, departments indicated that this could be provided by most faculty members. At the University of Toronto, Council notes that students are permitted to answer translation examination questions in French or English.

---

[19] York University, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, February 20, 1986, p. 2.

The York University proposal for the creation of additional programs in Hispanic Studies raises Council's long-standing concerns regarding the rationalization and consolidation of undergraduate programming, and the prevention of unwarranted program duplication. In System Rationalization: A Responsibility and an Opportunity, Council cites the Report of the Committee on Long-Range Planning of the Council of Ontario Universities which notes:

> ...the tendency to uniformity exists here as elsewhere, so that (for example) one finds about 270 courses in Spanish language and Literature listed in the calendars, and almost another 100 in Spanish American, while in contrast, with the exception of about a dozen courses in Finnish at Lakehead and Laurentian, there appears not to be a single course in the language, literature, and culture of Scandinavia...One must ask whether the cause of diversity or of public need is best served in such circumstances.[20]

Since it appears that the student demand for Hispanic Studies courses is already being met by existing course offerings at Glendon College, and since there is overwhelming evidence of excess capacity in the university system as a whole, and in view of Council's long-term concerns regarding program duplication and the desire to effect the most economical distribution of resources in a time of economic constraint, it is Council's conviction that this proposed program does not meet Council's criterion of societal need.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-30 **FUNDING FOR THE COMBINED HONOURS BA [MAJOR AND MINOR] AND GENERAL HONOURS BA [MAJOR] IN HISPANIC STUDIES PROGRAMS AT YORK UNIVERSITY, (GLENDON COLLEGE) FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the Combined Honours BA [Major and Minor] and General Honours BA [Major] programs in Hispanic Studies

---

[20] Ontario Council on University Affairs, Seventh Annual Report, 1980-81, p. 59.

> **at York University (Glendon College) be deemed ineligible for formula support.**

Labour Studies (Honours BA), McMaster University

On February 11, 1986, McMaster University requested that Council consider for funding approval its new undergraduate quasi-professional honours program in Labour Studies. McMaster University has offered a three-year bachelor's program in Labour Studies since 1981. Therefore, Council's consideration of this program is of a cursory nature.

The addition of an honours Labour Studies component to the existing program received approval from McMaster's Senate on February 12, 1986. This program will provide students in the three-year BA program with the opportunity to pursue their interest in labour studies in greater depth and will enable them to compete more effectively for employment and graduate study opportunities in the industrial relations field.

In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the program proposal to the Council of Ontario Universities for comment. Institutional respondents had no objection to the establishment of this program. At this time the McMaster program is unique in Canada. Council notes that York University is planning to mount a similar program in the near future.

McMaster projects a strong student demand for the honours program. A departmental survey revealed that 32 of 35 third-year students were interested in an honours Labour Studies program. The University expects a steady-state enrolment of 15 to 20 students per year in the four-year program.[21]

As the resource implications of the proposal are minimal, and the program is unique, Council believes that it should be recommended for funding even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

---

[21] McMaster University. Request for Funding, BA Honours Labour Studies, February 11, 1986, pp. 1 and 2.

OCUA 86-31

FUNDING FOR THE HONOURS BACHELOR OF ARTS PROGRAM IN LABOUR STUDIES AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89

THAT, the Honours BA program in Labour Studies at McMaster University be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the mov-ing average for the university - the program to be in Category 2, and the upper years' enrolment to carry a weight of 1.5, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

Music Performance (Honours BMus), McMaster University

On February 4, 1986, McMaster University requested that Council consider for funding approval its new undergraduate honours program in Music Performance. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the program proposal to the Council of Ontario Universities for comment. Although there were no objections to the program, some concerns were registered with regard to the limited total number of students in the system possessing the required performance skills from which another comprehensive instrumental performance program could be composed.[22]

This program was also circulated to the Academic Advisory Committee of Council for comment on the criteria of Societal Need and Student Demand, Uniqueness and Institutional Appropriateness (See Appendix A).

1. Proposed Curriculum

The Honours Bachelor of Music in Music Performance program proposed by McMaster focuses on ensemble playing and chamber music performance. Courses involve practical study on the students' major instrument, the study and performance of chamber music and pedagogical studies.

---

[22] Letter from Dr. Edward J. Monahan, Executive Director, Council of Ontario Universities, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, November 10, 1986, p. 2.

2. Academic Quality

Council notes that this program received Senate approval on February 12, 1986.

3. Financial Viability

Council is satisfied that the program is financially viable based on an income and expenditure review by the McMaster Board/Senate Committee on Academic Planning, which endorsed the program's financial viability.[23]

4. Projected Enrolment

McMaster projects a steady-state enrolment of 10 students in year-4 by 1989-90 and a total increase in department size of 40 to 45 students by 1992.[24]

5. Co-operating with other Post-Secondary Institutions

No co-operation with other universities is planned.

6. Societal Need And Student Demand

In its submission, McMaster University indicates that there are a number of students who wish to enrol in Music Performance at McMaster for economic and geographic reasons.[25] However, upon reviewing the current enrolment and capacity levels at other Ontario institutions, Council found that the demand for music performance programs has been stable over the past five years and that there is significant excess capacity in existing programs.

Council's survey of the nine institutions offering undergraduate music performance programs, or music programs with an applied music emphasis, revealed a significant amount of excess capacity within the system. Council found that excess capacity exists at Brock, Guelph, Ottawa, Queen's Toronto, Western, Wilfrid Laurier and Windsor universities. Council notes that the York University program is currently at capacity.

---

[23] McMaster University, Request for Funding, Music Performance (BMus), February 4, 1986, p. 1.

[24] McMaster University, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, July 7, 1986, p. 1.

[25] Ibid., p. 2.

After reviewing the relevant factors, Council accepts the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee, which concluded that the demand for music performance programs was relatively stable and that student demand did not appear to warrant the existence of an additional program within the system.

Council also concurs with the Academic Advisory Committee regarding societal need. The Committee noted significant excess capacity in music performance programs at institutions located near to the Hamilton region, indicating that the regional demand identified by McMaster can be met by existing programs.

It is Council's view, therefore, that this program does not meet the criteria for societal need and student demand.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-32 **FUNDING FOR THE HONOURS BACHELOR OF MUSIC PROGRAM IN MUSIC PERFORMANCE AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the Honours Bachelor of Music program in Music Performance at McMaster University be deemed ineligible for formula support.

Portuguese Studies (BA Minor), York University (Glendon College)

On June 5, 1986 York University requested that Council consider for funding approval a new undergraduate quasi-professional minor program in Portuguese Studies at Glendon College. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the program to the Council of Ontario Universities. Institutional responses indicated that there were no objections to the proposal.

1. Proposed Curriculum

Students must complete the equivalent of four full courses in order to obtain the minor degree in Portuguese Studies. Course content places emphasis upon language practice, composition skills, modern Portuguese literature and translation, and Luso-Brazilian culture and literature. The Portuguese minor can be combined with any other discipline offered at Glendon College.

2. Academic Quality

Council notes that the minor program in Portuguese Studies received approval from the Senate of York University on October 23, 1986.

3. Financial Viability

Council is aware that since 1984, York University has given the proposed program its support in principle, but, York has stated that full external support for this initiative must be obtained before it can be launched, because it cannot be funded from existing resources within the University.[26]

To mount the program, faculty members must be hired and catalogues and books must be purchased. Offers of external support have been received from a variety of organizations within the local Portuguese community. None of these organizations is willing to make a formal financial commitment to the program prior to the receipt of government funding approval.

By letter of January 22, 1987, the President of York University states:

> Should...[funding] approval be forthcoming...it would be my intention to immediately take steps to conclude the preferred arrangements for financial support and to thereby meet the conditions of financial viability required both by the Senate of York University and by Council...

---

[26] York University, Request for Funding, Minor in Portuguese Studies, June 5, 1986, p. 29, and Appendix VIII.

> Finally, we will be taking steps within our own budget to ensure that appropriate resources are available to support the program on a long-term basis.[27]

On the basis of this assurance from the President of York University, that the program will not be mounted unless external funding is attained for its establishment, and that it will be supported on a long-term basis by the University, Council is satisfied that the program meets the criterion of financial viability.

4. Projected Enrolment

York's enrolment projections suggest that 180 students will avail themselves of the opportunity to enrol in courses offered within the Portuguese minor program. Thirty-five students are projected to graduate each year with a minor in Portuguese.[28]

5. Co-operation with other Post-Secondary Institutions

There does not appear to be any plan for co-operation with other post-secondary institutions in Ontario. However, York University has plans for a significant amount of interaction and co-operation with Portuguese organizations. In particular, the Institute de Cultura e Lingua Portuguese has offered to contribute books and language tapes, the Universities of Porto and the Azores have offered to engage in an exchange of students and academic staff and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation has offered to contribute books, and to engage in scholarly exchanges with the York faculty.[29]

---

[27] Letter from Dr. Harry W. Arthurs, President, York University, to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, January 22, 1987, pp. 1-2.

[28] York University, Request for Funding, Minor in Portuguese Studies, June 5, 1986, p. 22.

[29] Ibid., pp. 42-46.

6. Societal Need And Student Demand

Council notes that close to 300 members of the Portuguese community gathered in March of 1984 to express their desire to have a Portuguese Studies program offered at York University. On the same occasion, the Ambassador of Portugal, on behalf of the Portuguese Government, offered the University a library collection.[30] Council has received letters in support of the proposed program from the York University Portuguese Association, representing some of the 600 Portuguese-Canadians attending classes at York University, Le Bureau des Communications Afro-Glendon, the Toronto Portuguese Parents Association and many others. Letters of support indicate that there is a demand for this program from both current and former students of York University and from the Portuguese community.

Council acknowledges that approximately 300,000 people of Portuguese descent live in Ontario. Further, there are 18,520 students studying the Portuguese language at elementary and secondary schools in the Toronto area.[31]

In their submission to Council, York suggests that the availability of this program's graduates may help Canada expand investments and economic relations with Portuguese speaking countries in Asia, Africa and Brazil. York also indicates that the large Portuguese communities in Toronto and Montreal require professionals fluent in Portuguese as well as in Canada's two official languages. There is also a need for students of Romance languages to develop a facility in Portuguese for graduate study research work.[32]

Council is satisfied that there is both a societal need and a student demand for this program.

7. Uniqueness

York has argued that the minor program in Portuguese studies is unique because it is offered in a bilingual setting at Glendon College. Council does not believe that the bilingual environment in which the program is offered makes the program different from the existing program at the University of Toronto since both programs are conducted entirely in Portuguese.

---

[30] Ibid., p. 2.

[31] Ibid., p. 22.

[32] Ibid., p. 1.

However, since there is only one other Portuguese Studies program in the province, at the University of Toronto, and since the language courses in that program are at capacity, Council believes that this is a case of justifiable program duplication, given the sizable student demand for a Portuguese Studies program at York University.

8. Local and Regional Support for the Program

Council acknowledges the overwhelming local and regional support for this program as evidenced by voluminous correspondence from the Portuguese community, representatives of Portuguese organizations, and students and staff of York University.

9. Institutional Appropriateness

Council notes that York University does not currently offer a program in Portuguese Studies, and that the addition of such a program will broaden the existing offerings within Glendon College's Romance Language programs, School of Translation, and Languages and Linguistics programs. Since Glendon College has a fully-equipped language laboratory and the proposed minor in Portuguese Studies is appropriate to Glendon's emphasis on liberal arts and multicultural studies, Council believes that it is appropriate for a minor in Portuguese Studies to be offered there.

10. Funding in a Time of Constraint

In light of the local and regional demand for this program and since the case for justifiable duplication can be made, Council believes that this program is deserving of funding even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-33 **FUNDING FOR THE MINOR PROGRAM IN PORTUGUESE STUDIES AT YORK UNIVERSITY (GLENDON COLLEGE), FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the minor program in Portuguese Studies at York University, (Glendon College), be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving average for the university - the program to be in Category 1, with a weight of 1.0, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

II. Professional Programs

Civil Engineering and Computer Systems (BEng), McMaster University

Council has examined the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding McMaster University's new professional program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems (see Appendix B).

Council acknowledges that this program will meet the current and long-term needs of both students and employers by helping to address the societal demands resulting from an increase in the use of advanced computing techniques in the field of civil engineering. Council notes that there is an immediate demand for program graduates. The program has been fully endorsed by the Council of Ontario Deans of Engineering.

Council acknowledges that the emphasis upon advanced computer techniques and the five-year academic format make this engineering program unique. Council has never approved undergraduate programs which require more than four years to complete. The five-year format, common to other undergraduate engineering programs at McMaster University, predates Council's approvals process. It is Council's view that the five-year single-degree undergraduate engineering program format is unique to McMaster University's engineering department and therefore is appropriate in this particular instance.

This program is consistent with existing institutional strengths in the areas of computer science and engineering at McMaster and will not entail the procurement of significant additional resources. Council, therefore, believes that the Bachelor of Engineering program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems should be recommended for funding, even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-34 **FUNDING FOR THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAM IN CIVIL ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the BEng program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems at McMaster University be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving-average for the university - the program to be in Category 3, with a weight of 2.0, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

Materials Engineering (BEng), McMaster University

Council has examined the advice of its Academic Advisory Committee regarding McMaster University's new professional program in Materials Engineering (see Appendix C).

Council acknowledges that the emphasis of this program is on the structure and use of modern engineering materials. Of particular note to Council is the significant amount of industrial support for this program as shown by written representations from numerous industrial representatives who indicated a need for materials engineering specialists in their organizations. Corporate support for the program is both locally and regionally based.

Council is aware that this is the first program in Ontario to focus on modern materials engineering, and that it has been fully endorsed by the Council of Ontario Deans of Engineering.

Council accepts that the introduction of this program will effect a redistribution of existing enrolments within the Department of Materials Science and

Engineering and that the program is largely based on existing resources.

This program is consistent with McMaster's existing program strengths and with the University's current research emphasis. Council therefore recommends the funding of this program, even in a time of economic constraint.

Accordingly, Council recommends to the Minister:

OCUA 86-35 **FUNDING FOR THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAM IN MATERIALS ENGINEERING AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY FOR 1988-89**

THAT, the BEng program in Materials Engineering at McMaster University be deemed eligible for formula support beginning in 1988-89 and that eligible enrolment, from 1987-88 on, be included in the moving-average for the university - the program to be in Category 3, with a weight of 2.0, as outlined in the Ministry's Operating Formula Manual.

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

February 20, 1987

Appendix A

ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ontario Council on University Affairs
700 Bay St., 7th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z6

January 19, 1987

Dr. Charles Carmichael
Chairman
Program Committee
Ontario Council on University Affairs
700 Bay St., 7th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z6

Dear Dr. Carmichael:

At your request, the Academic Advisory Committee has reviewed the proposal submitted by McMaster University for a new undergraduate program in Music Performance (BMus) on the criteria of Need - Societal and Student Demand, Program Uniqueness and Institutional Appropriateness. The conclusions of the Committee follow.

Need - Societal and Student Demand

Student Demand

After reviewing enrolment levels in Music Performance programs at other universities, the Committee concluded that total demand for performance programs was relatively stable and that student demand did not warrant the existence of an additional program within the system.

Societal Need

Our review of existing music performance programs revealed a significant amount of excess capacity throughout the system and that this excess capacity is located at institutions near to the Hamilton region. The Committee believes that the existence of music performance programs with excess capacity in the same geographic region as the location of the proposed Dr. C.

program, indicates that the regional demand can be met by existing programs. Therefore, it is the Committee's view that this program does not meet the societal need criteria.

Uniqueness

After reviewing existing music performance programs, the Committee does not consider the Music Performance program proposed by McMaster to be unique. Since there is currently excess capacity within the system, the case for justifiable duplication cannot be made.

Institutional Appropriateness

The Academic Advisory Committee considers McMaster University to be an appropriate institution at which to offer a Bachelor of Music Performance program.

Conclusion

It is the opinion of the Academic Advisory Committee that the Bachelor of Music Performance program proposed by McMaster University does not meet all of the necessary criteria. We hope these comments will be of use to you in your further deliberations on this subject.

Yours truly,

(original signed by Rod Fraser)

Rod Fraser
Chairman
Academic Advisory Committee

RF/cg

Appendix B

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Civil Engineering and Computer Systems (BEng), McMaster University
New Undergraduate Professional Program Considered for Formula Funding

On February 4, 1986, McMaster University requested that Council consider for funding approval its new undergraduate professional program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the program proposal to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) which, in turn, asked for and received advice concerning the proposal from the Council of Ontario Deans of Engineering (CODE). Council referred the program and COU's comments to its Academic Advisory Committee and asked for specific advice thereon.

The Committee's findings with respect to the program are summarized below.

1. Proposed Curriculum

Civil Engineering and Computer Systems is a five-year program of the same general format as the existing Civil Engineering and Management program. This program proposes to train fully-qualified civil engineers who will have advanced computing skills as a result of taking ten additional courses in Computer Science. It combines the full Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board of the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CEAB) approved civil engineering program course requirements with the equivalent of an additional year of computer science courses which are offered by the Department of Computer Science and Systems. These additional courses provide the student with a sound basis in advanced programming concepts, database management, software engineering and microcomputer interfacing.

2. Academic Quality

The Committee notes that the program received Senate approval on February 12, 1986 and that it was fully endorsed by the Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering in September 1986.

3. Financial Viability of the Program

In its submission, the University states that the proposed program will draw upon existing resources. McMaster indicates that the creation of one new required engineering course, Interfacing Microcomputers, may create a need for additional hardware when year-5 students appear in the 1990-91 year. However, the proposal has been endorsed by the McMaster Board/Senate Committee on Academic Planning, which recommends on academic priorities to the Budget Committee. The Academic Advisory Committee accepts McMaster's statement that:

> ...the Department has made a strong committment to the Civil Engineering and Computer Systems programme and is convinced of its viability.[1]

4. Projected Enrolment

McMaster intends to maintain existing limits on total enrolment in year 1 and 2 Engineering programs, therefore, this program will merely effect a redistribution of existing enrolments. McMaster projects a steady-state annual enrolment of 8 to 10 students, to be achieved by 1988-89. This program will create a net increase in engineering enrolment of between eight and ten students in year 5, beginning in 1990-91.[2]

5. Co-operation with other Post-Secondary Institutions

No co-operation with other institutions has been planned.

---

[1] McMaster University, Request for Funding, Civil Engineering and Computer Systems, (BEng), February 4, 1986, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

6. Student Demand and Societal Need

McMaster anticipates a steady student demand for this program. After reviewing the program, Dr. R. White, Chairman of the Department of Civil Engineering at Cornell stated:

> The proposed new degree in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems is an excellent idea--one that should attract a new group of students who will see Civil Engineering as a high tech area with a rich future for computer applications and use of computers in design.[3]

A McMaster survey of first year engineering students revealed that there were eight to ten students per year who would be interested in enrolling in the program in additionto students who would be attracted to McMaster by the existence of this new program.[4]

In its initial submission, McMaster indicated that the department of Civil Engineering had long recognized the need to provide graduates with a high level of computing skills. To facilitate this goal, the department was active in the development of the MacEngMicro program, which allows students to purchase their own microcomputers on an affordable basis. It also introduced an undergraduate course in computer applications and includes a significant number of computing assignments in years 3 and 4 of the civil engineering program.

McMaster suggests that employers now desire civil engineering graduates with more advanced computing skills and expects this trend to accelerate in the near future:

> Engineering companies are realizing that their 'competitive edge' is more and more dependent upon computing resources...Such employers are already looking for graduate engineers with extensive computing experience. On the other extreme, there are firms which have not yet realized the need for, or potential of, well organized computing

---

[3] McMaster University, Response to OCUA Request for Additional Information, October, 1986, p. 4.

[4] Ibid., p. 2.

> capabilities; these employers will definitely be looking for the same expertise in the very near future as they come to recognize the impact upon productivity.[5]

A telephone survey conducted by the department revealed that there is employer interest in hiring program graduates, with some employers indicating that they had an immediate demand for civil engineering graduates with advanced computing skills.

McMaster indicates that by providing civil engineers with specialized computer skills this program will help Ontario to meet the new challenges posed by the work activities of an information-based society and notes that "employers across the entire spectrum of civil engineering activity are encouraging our efforts."[6]

The Committee is satisfied that there is a student demand and societal need for this new program.

7. Program Uniqueness

The Civil Engineering and Computer Systems program is the first of its type to be offered in Canada. The Committee is satisfied that the program is unique.

8. Local and Regional Support

Letters of support for the program, provided by McMaster from the Director of Transportation Planning for the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and the Senior Human Resources Services Officer from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, Government of Ontario, both strongly endorse the program and indicate an increasing demand for this type of graduate.[7] The Committee is satisfied that the program has both local and regional support.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 2.

[6] Ibid., p. 4.

9. Institutional Appropriateness

Given McMaster's clearly established strengths in civil engineering and computer science, and that combined-discipline undergraduate engineering programs of five years in length is a format unique to McMaster engineering programs, the Committee agrees that McMaster University is an appropriate institution at which to offer this program.

10. Funding

The Committee, therefore, recommends to Council that:

> the new BEng program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems at McMaster University be recommended by Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
January 19, 1987

---

[7] Letter from Mr. D. Turvey, Director of Transportation Planning, The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth to Dr. D. Stolle, Assistant Professor, McMaster University, December 18, 1985; and
Letter from Mr. R. Barnes, Senior Human Resources Services Officer, Ministry of Transportation and Communications to Dr. D. Stolle, Assistant Professor, McMaster University, November 12, 1985.

Appendix C

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Materials Engineering (BEng), McMaster University
New Undergraduate Professional Program Considered for Formula Funding

On February 4, 1986, McMaster University requested that Council consider for funding approval its new undergraduate professional program in Materials Engineering. In accordance with established procedures, Council circulated the program proposal to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) which, in turn, asked for and received advice concerning the proposal from the Council of Ontario Deans of Engineering (CODE). Council referred the program and COU's comments to its Academic Advisory Committee and asked for specific advice thereon.

The Committee's findings with respect to the program are summarized below:

1. Proposed Curriculum

Materials Engineering involves the study of the physical properties of engineering materials, their structures and methods of production. Emphasis will be placed upon the study of modern metals, ceramics, semiconductors and other non-traditional materials. The program, offered by the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, requires each student to complete a senior thesis prior to graduation.

2. Academic Quality

The Committee notes that the program received Senate approval on February 12, 1986 and that it was fully endorsed by the Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering in September 1986.

3. Financial Viability of the Program

The McMaster submission indicates that this program is largely based on existing resources and requires no new courses. The Committee notes that the proposal was reviewed and endorsed by the Board/Senate Committee on Academic Planning which considers resource implications and recommends on academic priorities. The Committee is satisfied that the program is financially viable.

4. Projected Enrolment

Since enrolment in the years 1 and 2 Engineering program is limited, no changes or net increases in student numbers are projected for the department of Materials Science and Engineering. University projections suggest that 10 of the 40 students entering year-2 programs in the department will select the Materials Engineering program. The Department projects a steady-state enrolment of 10 students in each year of the program by 1989-90.[1]

5. Co-operation with other Post-Secondary Institutions

No co-operation with other universities has been planned.

6. Student Demand and Societal Need

McMaster indicates that a number of students in first year Engineering have expressed an interest in the program.

McMaster states that this program was proposed in response to the development and use of new materials in industry, and to an anticipated growth of interest and opportunity in this area in the near future.[2] Letters of support received from representatives of Alcan, Consumers Glass, Dofasco, Bell Northern Research, Cominco Metals, IPSCO Inc. and GaAs Devices reflect a need for materials engineering specialists and indicate support for this program. The Committee is satisfied that there is a student demand and societal need for this program.

---

[1] McMaster University, *Request for Funding, Materials Engineering (BEng)*, Feb. 4, 1986, p. 2.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 2.

7. Program Uniqueness

McMaster is the first university in Canada to offer such a program.

8. Local and Regional Support

Studies in metallurgy and glass science have been previously funded by the Steel Company of Canada and by a number of Canadian glass companies. Continuing private donations indicate industrial support for the work of the department and its efforts to expand into the area of modern materials. As previously noted, the program is supported by major corporations located about the province. The Committee is satisfied that there is local and regional support for this program.

9. Institutional Appropriateness

The Committee notes that McMaster University has well-established teaching and research activities in the related areas of physics, chemistry, mechanical engineering, engineering physics, metallurgy, and ceramics. These emphasis are complemented by McMaster's Institute for Materials Research. Given the existence of these related areas of strength, the Committee agrees that it is appropriate for McMaster to offer a program in Materials Engineering.

10. Funding

The Committee, therefore, recommends to Council that:

> the new BEng program in Materials Engineering at McMaster University, be recommended to Council as being eligible for formula funding support.

Academic Advisory Committee
January 19, 1987

OCUA PUBLIC HEARINGS 1986-87

OCUA did not hold any public hearings during 1986-87 since the Commission on the Future Development of Universities of Ontario was conducting public hearings.

OCUA RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES 1986-87

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER	TITLE	RESPONSE
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-I	
86-1	Master of Science in Manufacturing Management at GMI Engineering and Management Institute	Accepted
86-2	Doctor of Ministry at St. Stephen's College	Accepted
86-3	Master of Arts (Education), Master of Science (Education), at Niagara University	Not Accepted
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-II	
86-4	Level of Support for Major Repairs, Renovations, Alterations and Replacement Projects in 1987-88 for the Cyclical Renewal of the Existing Capital Stock	Not Accepted
86-5	Level of Support for Deferred Maintenance of Physical Plant in 1987-88	Not Accepted
86-6	Equipment and Library Funding for 1987-88	Accepted
86-7	Operating Grants Allocation Adjustment Funding for 1987-88	Partially Accepted
86-8	Program Adjustment Grants for 1987-88	Partially Accepted
86-9	Funding for 1987-88 for the Bar Admission Course	Not Accepted
86-10	Government Operating Grants for 1988-89 to Meet the Cost of Council's Basic Objectives in Funding Provincially-Assisted Universities and their Affiliated Colleges, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario College of Art and Dominican College	Not Accepted
86-11	Formula Fee Rates for 1988-89 to Meet the Cost of Council's Basic Objectives	Not Accepted

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER	TITLE	RESPONSE
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-IV	
86-12	Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology at the Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago	Accepted
86-13	Master of Arts in Education Concentration in Community College Education at Central Michigan University	Accepted
86-14	Master of Science in Education Specialization in Outdoor Education at Northern Illinois University	Accepted
86-15	Master of Science in Biology Emphasis in Human Nutrition at the University of Bridgeport	Accepted
86-16	Doctor of Philosophy at the Free University of Amsterdam in Co-operation with the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto	Accepted
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-V	
86-17	Funding for Programs Now Authorized to be Offered by Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and Nipissing College	Accepted
86-18	Funding for Other Laurentian Programs Offered at Algoma College, Le College de Hearst and Nipissing College on Behalf of Laurentian University	Accepted
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-VI	
86-19	Ontario Graduate Scholarship Stipends 1987-88	Not Accepted
86-20	Number of Ontario Graduate Scholarships for 1987-88	Accepted
86-21	Institutional Awards to Universities Without Doctoral Programs	Partially[1] Accepted
86-22	Ontario Graduate Scholarships to Persons on Student Visas	Accepted

---

1. See Minister's February 2, 1987 letter which follows this table.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER	TITLE	RESPONSE
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-VII	
86-23	Distribution Mechanism with Respect to Formula Grants, Formula Fees and Extra-Formula Grants for Implementation for the Funding Year 1987-88	Accepted
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-VIII	
86-24	Funding for the Master's Program in Accounting at the University of Waterloo for 1988-89	Accepted
86-25	Funding for the Master's Program in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies at Trent University in 1988-89	Accepted
86-26	Funding for the Doctoral Program in Computer Science for 1988-89	Accepted
86-27	Funding for the Graduate Diploma in Legal Translation at the University of Ottawa for 1988-89	Accepted
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-IX	
86-28	Funding for the Administrative and Information Studies Stream at the University of Western Ontario for 1988-89	Accepted
86-29	Funding for the Bachelor of Arts and Honours Bachelor of Arts Programs in Gerontology and Another Subject at McMaster University for 1988-89	Accepted
86-30	Funding for the Combined Honours BA [Major and Minor] and General Honours BA [Major] in Hispanic Studies Programs at York Univesity, (Glendon College) for 1988-89	Accepted
86-31	Funding for the Honours Bachelor of Arts Program in Labour Studies at McMaster University for 1988-89	Accepted
86-32	Funding for the Honours Bachelor of Music Program in Music Performance at McMaster University for 1988-89	Accepted

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER	TITLE	RESPONSE
	ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-IX (continued)	
86-33	Funding for the Minor Program in Portuguese Studies at York University (Glendon College), for 1988-89	Accepted
86-34	Funding for the Bachelor's Program in Civil Engineering and Computer Systems At McMaster University for 1988-89	Accepted
86-35	Funding for the Bachelor's Program in Materials Engineering at McMaster University for 1988-89	Accepted

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY MEMORANDUM 86-VI

Minister
Ministre

Ministry of
Colleges and
Universities

Ministère des
Collèges et
Universités

(416) 965-8282

101 Bloor Street West
13th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1P7

101, rue Bloor ouest
13e étage
Toronto (Ontario)
M5S 1P7

February 2, 1987

Mrs. Marnie Paikin
Chairman
Ontario Council on University
Affairs
700 Bay Street
7th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1Z6

Dear Mrs. Paikin:

I would like to thank the Council for the advice contained in its Advisory Memorandum 86-VI, "The Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program, 1987-88".

I have accepted the following recommendations of the Council:

i) that at least 1,200 scholarships be made available under the Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program;

ii) that 40 scholarships be deemed as institutional awards, and allocated equally among Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian and Trent Universities; and

iii) that 60 scholarships be reserved for visa students.

The value of the graduate scholarship award will be increased by 4 percent, from $2,920 per term to $3,035 per term. Sufficient funds are not available at this time to increase the stipend value to the extent recommended by the Council.

The above changes, with the exception of the one on institutional awards, will be implemented for the 1987-88 competition. Because the terms of the 1987-88 competition were announced in September 1986 and the processing of applications is already under way, the recommendation on reallocation of institutional awards will be effective for the 1988-89 competition.

Thank you again for your recommendations on the Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program.

Yours truly,

Gregory Sorbara
Minister

UPDATE TO PROGRAM APPROVALS PROCEDURE

Ontario
Council on
University
Affairs

416/965-5233

7th Floor
700 Bay Street
Toronto Ontario
M5G 1Z6

February 26, 1987

Honourable Gregory Sorbara
Minister
Ministry of Colleges and Universities
101 Bloor Street West
13th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1P7

Dear Mr. Sorbara:

In OCUA's 1984 annual report on new programs offered at Ontario universities in the "core" Arts and Sciences, Council forwarded documentation relating to the introduction of Biotechnology programs at Carleton and Guelph universities. In that report, Council did not include these programs in the list of new "core" Arts and Science programs since Council intended to consult with COU regarding developments in the area of biotechnology, which appeared to be an emerging quasi-professional field within the Ontario university system. [Letter of September 6, 1984]

Having received the report of the Committee of Vice-Presidents (Academic), COU, and having considered the development of biotechnology programs, Council is pleased to provide you with its findings on this subject.

The term biotechnology describes processes involving the modification of cells. The area of basic science involved is cell biology. Biotechnological techniques are used in the fields of agriculture, chemistry, engineering, medicine and various biological specializations.

The report of the Vice-Presidents (Academic), COU, states:

> Biotechnology is a relatively new label for a variety of phenomena, techniques, and processes which have been studied within a broad range of parent disciplines for some time. In Biotechnology this knowledge is

> being focussed on biological processes to provide goods and services. Consequently, the integration of existing activity is an important element in developing capability in Biotechnology.
>
> New academic programs involve for the most part a rearrangement of existing courses and do not require substantial additional resources.

It is Council's view that any modern undergraduate biology program should expose students to the techniques of biotechnology and provide students with some experience in its use. Opportunities for the study of advanced biotechnological techniques are most commonly available at the graduate program level.

Concerning the classification of biotechnology programs, Council believes that it is not appropriate to identify or classify an area of study based on a changing technique. It is Council's view that the use of the label biotechnology in new programs reflects creative program titling on the part of the universities rather than an emerging new quasi-professional program area.

Council believes it to be most appropriate for the universities to offer study in the techniques of biotechnology within established programs in Science, Engineering, Agriculture or Medicine and that there should be no need to include the term biotechnology in new program names.

Council, therefore, concludes that no direct action on the part of the Council is required at this time, and that new programs labelled "biotechnology" be classified as "core" Arts and Science programs.

In view of this conclusion, Council would like to add the following programs to the list of new programs introduced in "core" Arts and Science disciplines:

Carleton
- Honours Biology and Biotechnology, BSc
- Honours Biochemistry and Biotechnology, BSc

Guelph
- Minor in Biotechnology

McMaster
- Honours Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, BSc

Windsor
- Honours Biology/Biotechnology, BSc

Yours sincerely,

Marnie Paikin

Marnie Paikin
Chairman

c.c. E. Monahan

MP/cg